

RĀMĀNUJA  
ON THE BHAGAVADGĪTĀ

**J. A. B. VAN BUITENEN**

**RĀMĀNUJA**  
**ON THE BHAGAVADGĪTĀ**

**A CONDENSED RENDERING OF HIS  
GĪTĀBHĀṢYA WITH COPIOUS NOTES  
AND AN INTRODUCTION**

**MLSU - CENTRAL LIBRARY**



**64939CL**

**MOTILAL BANARSIDASS**  
**DELHI :: VARANASI :: PATNA**

©MOTILAL BANARSIDASS

Bungalow Road, Jawaharnagar, Delhi-7

Chowk, Varanasi, (U. P.)

Ashok Raj Path, Patna. (Bihar)

1ST REPRINT

1968

Rs. 20.00

PRINTED IN INDIA BY SHANTI LAL JAIN AT SHRI JAINENDRA  
PRESS, BUNGALOW ROAD JAWAHARNAGAR, DELHI-7 AND  
PUBLISHED BY SUNDAR LAL JAIN, MOTILAL BANARSIDASS,  
BUNGALOW ROAD, JAWAHARNAGAR, DELHI-7

## FOREWORD TO THE SECOND EDITION

It is a matter of great gratification to the author that Messrs Motilal Banarsidass have decided to issue a reprint of the present book. The original limited edition has been out of print for many years and as scholars and students have seemed to find it useful in their study for Rāmānuja and Viśiṣṭādvaita, it is hoped that a reprint will be welcomed.

The limitations of reproduction by off-set have the disadvantage that no changes can be made in the body of the text. Apart from the title page, the table of contents and this foreword, which replaces the original Dutch foreword, the book therefore is identical with the original.

The author would like to record once more here his great debt to Dr. J. Gonda, Professor of Sanskrit at the University of Utrecht, under whose guidance this study was begun and completed.

As in the Introduction I mention the comparative neglect of Rāmānuja and Viśiṣṭādvaita in modern scholarship, this might be a good opportunity to record with a great deal of pleasure the upsurge in such studies since 1953 and to add here a selected bibliography that should supplement the one that is given in the book.

Several general works have appeared, notably :

Frederick K. Lazarus, *The Metaphysics of Rāmānuja and Bowne* (Thesis Boston University 1957)

M. A. Ayyanger, *The Philosophy of Rāmānuja* (New Delhi 1958)

K. D. Bhardwaj, *The Philosophy of Rāmānuja* (New Delhi 1958)

A. Hohenberger, *Rāmānuja : ein Philosoph indischer Gottesmystik* (Bonn 1960)

Rāmānuja's Vedārthasaṃgraha in particular has been studied widely. Almost simultaneously three different scholars worked on it and their research fructified in a critical edition, translation and

introduction by the present author (Poona 1956), a translation by M. R. R. Ayyangar (Kumbhakonam 1956), and an edition and translation by S. S. Raghavacari (1956). The last scholar published separately an *Introduction to the Vedārthasaṅgraha* (Mangalore 1957).

It is to be hoped that this recent development in Rāmānuja studies will prove the harbinger of a long and sustained interest in India as well as the West.

New Delhi, April 24, 1968

J. A. B. van Buitenen

## PREFACE

There is no doubt that Rāmānuja's Commentary on the Vedānta-sūtras, or Śrībhāṣya, is the most important work of this great Indian thinker. Yet, its very importance has led modern scholars to neglect the study of his other writings: for the interest of Rāmānuja's Commentary was derived, not from his own original genius, but from that of his famous antipode, Śaṅkara. Rāmānuja's interpretations of the Sūtras and his general views on Advaita were studied too exclusively in juxtaposition with the monistic system of Śaṅkara. However elucidating such a juxtaposition may be, it will give the student only a limited view of Rāmānuja's complete personality; while focusing the light on the intellectual aspects of his philosophical system, it cannot but obscure the aspects of devotion and religion. It seems to me that the study of his commentary on the Bhagavadgītā will, perhaps not increase but certainly deepen, our knowledge of his profoundly religious system. In the Gītābhāṣya the great religious and moral significance of the Gītā is set forth with the philosophical subtlety of the author of the Śrībhāṣya and the pastoral fervour of the priest of the temple of Śrīraṅga.

It has been my object to present this commentary on the Gītā to the public in as lucid a form as possible. In a short introduction I have tried to give an account of the various aspects of this text. In the first chapter the basic assumptions of Rāmānuja's doctrine are sketched in outline and the attention is drawn to the parallelism between the relation of the Gītā to the earlier upaniṣads and that of Rāmānuja to Śaṅkara. The second chapter deals with the place of the Gītā in Rāmānuja's system and with his indebtedness to Yāmuna, whose Gītārthasaṃgraha is included in an appendix together with a verbatim translation into English. In the third chapter I have sought to determine the relation of the Gītābhāṣya to the Śrībhāṣya and their relative dates. In the fourth chapter I have given a brief account of Rāmānuja's views on the doctrines of the Gītā, dealing in greater detail with the relation between karma- and jñānayoga and with the position of prapatti. In the fifth chapter, finally, I have attempted a short exposition of Rāmānuja's methods in commenting on his text.

The introduction is followed by a condensed rendering of the Gītā-

introduction by the present author (Poona 1956), a translation by M. R. R. Ayyangar (Kumbhakonam 1956), and an edition and translation by S. S. Raghavacari (1956). The last scholar published separately an *Introduction to the Vedārthasaṃgraha* (Mangalore 1957).

It is to be hoped that this recent development in Rāmānuja studies will prove the harbinger of a long and sustained interest in India as well as the West.

New Delhi, April 24, 1968

J. A. B. van Buitenen

## LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

AS.	Yāmuna's Siddhitraya, part one: Ātmasiddhi; see Siddhitraya.
BhG.	Bhagavadgītā.
Dasgupta*	Surendranath Dasgupta, D. Litt., A History of Indian Philosophy, 4 vols. (3d vol. Cambridge 1940).
Edgerton, G(ītā)	Franklin Edgerton, The Bhagavad Gītā, translated and interpreted, 2 vols. (Harvard Or. Ser. vols. 38—39; Cambridge, Mass., 1946).
Falk, Nāma-rūpa	Nāma-rūpa and Dharma-rūpa (Calcutta 1943).
G(ītā)	Bhagavadgītā.
GAS.	Yāmuna's Gītārthasaṃgraha, included in an appendix to the present work; numbers refer to stanzas.
GBh.	1. Rāmānuja's Gītābhāṣya, edited with the Tātparyacandrikā of Veṅkaṭanātha, by V. N. Āpte (Ānandāśrama Sanskrit Ser. vol. 92; Bombay 1923). 2. Śaṅkara's Gītābhāṣya, edited by V. N. Āpte (Ānandāśrama Sanskrit Ser. vol. 34, 3d ed.; Bombay 1936).
Gonda, Bhakti	J. Gonda, Het begrip Bhakti (Tijdschrift voor Philosophie, Vol. 10, Nov. 1948).
Gonda, Brahman	J. Gonda, Notes on Brahman (Utrecht 1950).
Gov.	Ālṅkondaville Govindācārya, Śrī Bhagavad-Gīta, with Rāmānuja's commentary in English (Madras 1898). *
Govindācārya, Life of Rāmānuja	Ālṅkondaville Govindācārya, The life of Rāmānujācārya (Madras 1906). *
Intr.	Rāmānuja's Introduction to his Gītābhāṣya.
Intr. Ch.	Chapter of the Introduction to the present work.
Jha	Dr. Sir Ganganatha Jha, Pūrva-Mīmāṃsā in its sources (Benares 1942).



bhāṣya, based upon a complete translation of the text into Dutch. When this translation was all but completed, an old rendering of the bhāṣya by the Indian scholar A. Govindacārya came to my notice. Although I often had occasion to differ from his interpretations, I wish to acknowledge the help which his translation has given me. In general I have benefitted much by publications of Indian scholars, especially the writings of Mr P. N. Srinivasachari, in whom modern Viśiṣṭādvaita has found a learned and ardent interpreter, have been a constant inspiration to me.

I have but hesitantly ventured upon this study, fully conscious not only of my limited knowledge, but also of the great, almost insuperable difficulties which a Western student will meet in interpreting an Indian spirituality. Yet gradually I have been confirmed in my belief that in many respects the study of Ramanuja's system, in its theistic tenets so frequently and so intimately akin to Christianity, may lead a Western student to a deeper comprehension of the Indian genius. I do sincerely hope that Ramanuja's interpretations of the Bhagavadgītā will find their way alike to those who abhor, and to those who admire "the Indian philosophy" — as the richly varied trends of Indian thought and religion are usually styled without discrimination — for its unmitigated monism.

## LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

KS.	Yāmuna's Siddhitraya, part one: Ātmasiddhi; see Siddhitraya.
BhG.	Bhagavadgītā.
Dasgupta'	Surendranath Dasgupta, D. Litt., A History of Indian Philosophy, 4 vols. (3d vol. Cambridge 1940).
Edgerton, G(ītā)	Franklin Edgerton, The Bhagavad Gītā, translated and interpreted, 2 vols. (Harvard Or. Ser. vols. 38—39; Cambridge, Mass., 1946).
Falk, Nāma-rūpa G(ītā)	Nāma-rūpa and Dharma-rūpa (Calcutta 1943). Bhagavadgītā.
GAS.	Yāmuna's Gītārthasaṃgraha, included in an appendix to the present work; numbers refer to stanzas.
GBh.	1. Rāmānuja's Gītābhāṣya, edited with the Tātparyacandrikā of Venkatanātha, by V. N. Āpte (Ānandāśrama Sanskrit Ser. vol. 92; Bombay 1923). 2. Śaṅkara's Gītābhāṣya, edited by V. N. Āpte (Ānandāśrama Sanskrit Ser. vol. 34, 3d ed.; Bombay 1936).
Gonda, Bhakti	J. Gonda, Het begrip Bhakti (Tijdschrift voor Philosophie, Vol. 10, Nov. 1948).
Gonda, Brahman Gov.	J. Gonda, Notes on Brahman (Utrecht 1950). Ālkondaville Govindācārya, Śrī Bhagavad-Gīta, with Rāmānuja's commentary in English (Madras 1898). *)
Govindācārya, Life of Rāmānuja	Ālkondaville Govindācārya, The life of Rāmānujācārya (Madras 1906). *)
Intr.	Rāmānuja's Introduction to his Gītābhāṣya.
Intr. Ch.	Chapter of the Introduction to the present work.
Jha	Dr. Sir Ganganatha Jha, Pūrva-Mīmāṃsā in its sources (Benares 1942).

Kumarappa	Bharatan Kumarappa, M A ,Ph D ,The Hindu conception of the Deity as culminating in Rāmanuja (Thesis London 1934)
Lacombe, ASV	Olivier Lacombe, L'Absolu selon le Védānta (Paris 1937)
Lacombe, Notes	Olivier Lacombe, La doctrine morale et métaphysique de Rāmānuja, traduction (accompagnée du texte sanskrit) et notes (Paris 1938); numbers refer to the notes to his translation
Lamotte, Notes	Etienne Lamotte, Notes sur la Bhagavadgītā (Paris 1929)
M	Bṛhadāraṇyaka-Upaniṣad in the Mādhyamīna recension
NK	Nyayakosa, or Dictionary of Technical Terms of Indian Philosophy, by Bhīmīcārya Jhalakīkar and Vasudeva Sāstrin Abhyankar (Poona 1928) (in Sanskrit)
R	Ramānuja
Radhakrishnan, G	S Radhakrishnan, The Bhagavadgītā <sup>2</sup> , (London 1949)
Radhakrishnan, Ind Phil	S Radhakrishnan, Indian Philosophy <sup>8</sup> , 2 vols (London 1951)
Renou, Terminologie	Louis Renou, Terminologie grammaticale du sanskrit, 3 vols (Paris 1942)
S	śankara
sBh	Ramanuja's sribhāṣya, ed by Vasudeva Sāstrin Abhyankar (Bombay, Nirṇayasagara Press, 1915), NB references to sBh 1, 1, 1 are specified by the numbers of pages in <i>this</i> edition, all references to sBh are specified by the numbers of the corresponding pages in Th's translation
Siddhitrāya	Y muna s Siddhitrāya ed by S S A S T S P S M M Rama Mīśra Sāstrin (Chowkhamba Sanskrit Ser vol 36, Benares 1900) *)
Sinha	Jadunath Sinha Indian Psychology : Perception (London 1934)

Srinivisachari, Bhedābheda-vāda	P. N. Srinivasachari, M. A.. The Philosophy of Bhedābheda (Madras 1934).
Srinivisachari, Finite Self	P. N. Srinivasachari, M. A., Rāmānuja's idea of the Finite Self (Calcutta 1928).
Srinivasachari, G(ītā)	P. N. Srinivasachari, M. A., The ethical philosophy of the Gītā <sup>2</sup> (Madras 1948).
Srinivasachari, VA.	P. N. Srinivasachari, M. A., The Philosophy of Viśiṣṭādvaita (Adyar 1946).
Th.	George Thibaut, Vedānta-Sūtras with Rāmānuja's commentary (SBE. XLVIII; Oxford 1904).
V.	Veṅkatanātha's Tātparyacandrikā, if not specified, refers to the corresponding parts of his commentary on GBh.
VAK.	Viśiṣṭādvaitakośa, ed. by D. T. Tatacharya (Madras 1951).
Varadachari, Theory of knowledge	Dr. K. C. Varadachari, Sri Ramanuja's Theory of knowledge (Tirupati 1943).
Ved.	Rāmānuja's Vedārthasaṃgraha, ed. by S.S.P.S. Rāma Miśra śāstrin (Reprint from the Pandit. 2nd edition: Benares 1924); numbers refer to pages.
Y.	Yāmuna.
YID.	Śrīnivāsa's Yatindramatadipika, ed. by H. N. Apte (Ānandāśrama Sanskrit Ser. vol. 50; Bombay 1906); numbers refer to pages.

\*) kindly sent me on loan by the Librarian of the Indian Office Library, Commonwealth Relations Office, London.

N.B. In the notes the capital ś is rendered by Ç because this type was not available.

## CONTENTS

	page
Preface . . . . .	IX
List of abbreviations . . . . .	XI
Introduction . . . . .	1
Chapter I . . . . .	1
Chapter II . . . . .	5
Chapter III . . . . .	12
Chapter IV . . . . .	18
Chapter V . . . . .	28
Note on my Condensed Rendering . . . . .	40
A Condensed Rendering of the <i>Gñābhāṣya</i> . . . . .	43
Appendix: Text and translation of Yāmuna's <i>Gitārthasaṃgraha</i>	177
Index of quotations . . . . .	183
Index of terms . . . . .	186

# INTRODUCTION

## I

Rāmānuja is indisputably the greatest philosopher of the viśiṣṭādvaita<sup>1</sup> school of Vedāntamīmāṃsā. Moreover, he was the first Indian thinker who succeeded in creating a philosophical system out of the data of popular emotional religion. At the beginning of one of his earlier treatises, the Vedārthasaṃgraha,<sup>2</sup> he states his position thus: "True knowledge of the jīvātman and the Supreme Ātman, applied to the performance of the obligations imposed by the dharma of the various stations and stages of life, accompanying humble and pious acts of reverence for and meditation on the Supreme Person — these and similar acts being held most dear by the devotee — will result in the attainment of God."

In this succinct statement the main principles of his religious philosophy are implied. True knowledge may be had of the living, embodied, individual ātman and of the supreme, animating, personal God, who are distinguishable and not identical. From the individual existence of a plurality of embodied ātmans results, on the one hand, the importance of personal activity within the boundaries of an organized society in which the embodied ātmans occupy individual positions, and, on the other hand, an individual relationship of the embodied ātman to the Deity. The ātman's relation to God is marked by religious worship and pious representation and animated by a spirit of love for these very religious acts which have such an exalted object. These acts performed

<sup>1</sup> the term is often incorrectly interpreted as a karmadhāraya comp "qualified, modified non-dualism"; but it is a tatpuruṣa: *viśiṣṭasyadvaitam*, or, as Venkaṭanātha (Nyāyasiddhāntajana, quoted by Kuppaswami in Srinivasachari, Finite Self) puts it, *viśiṣṭasya viśiṣṭarūpam advaitam* "monism of the differenced, unity of the universe's spiritual and non-spiritual substances with and in God whom they modify by constituting His body".

<sup>2</sup> anterior at least to the CBh; the passage runs (Ved. 5) *jīvaśarāṁśīmayāśīdātmyajñānaśarīrakāśarīrāśramadharmetīkārīśarīratākaśarāmaśarīracarāṇaśarīgaladhyañśrāṇapraṇāṁdīr atyarīthapriyas tatprāptiḥśalah.*

In His absolute form He is knowledge and bliss, antagonistic to all evil, comprising all that is good His divine Personality takes more shape with His beautiful qualities and glorious manifestation, yet he is inaccessible to perception, inexpressible by speech, inconceivable by thought Nevertheless, all perception speech and thought are concerned with God, for He is the divine reality underlying all and everything Everything forms part of his glorious supernal manifestation, his signiory and dominion<sup>4</sup> So everything forms a mode of God, a prakāra which is attributable to Him, subservient to Him and effected by Him And God and his modes are indissolubly connected in a perfect and everlasting unity

This is the truth which Rāmānuja distils from the upanīśads, the same scriptures from which Sankara derives a very different view The question of whose interpretation is the correct one need not concern us here<sup>5</sup> What we are concerned with is the important fact that Rāmānuja had to justify his interpretation and build his system against Śankara's Before he could start on developing and elaborating within the pales of the Vedānta school of thought the views set forth by his predecessors, he had to refute Sankara's entire philosophy and to prove that the great revelations of the upanīśads admitted of a very different interpretation That he was fully aware of this is clear, the first doctrine he summarizes in the Vedārthasamgraha after summing up his own position is Sankara's,<sup>6</sup> the purvapaksin to his great Siddhānta is again Śankara

Rāmānuja was, though not literally,<sup>7</sup> a pupil of Yāmuna who was the first to introduce the conception of bhakti into the Vedānta Much of what we see blossoming into full maturity in Rāmānuja's works we see budding in Yāmuna's writings And Yamuna was the grandson and successor of Nāthamuni, the first of the ācāryas who tried to give a philosophical expression to the thoughts scattered throughout the inspired hymns of the Ālvārs, and these hymns were the answer of the South-Indian Vaisnavas to latter-day Buddhism, just as in its way Śankara's system was also an answer

Rāmānuja, carrying on what Yamuna had only just begun to do,

<sup>4</sup> *śikhāṭi*, *asurāja* and *nīyamana*-, the rendering "supernal manifestation" is Edgerton's

<sup>5</sup> the less so because the upanīśads forming no unity whatever, do not admit of one systematic interpretation.

<sup>6</sup> Ved 12 14

<sup>7</sup> tradition has it that R never met Yāmuna before the latter's death (*Srīmadrasachari*, VA, p 515, *Govindācārya* Life of Rāmānuja, p 55 ff)

attempted to give the Bhagavadgītā its legitimate place among the authoritative texts of the Vedānta. With this attempt the wheel of Indian thought had swung around once more. The earlier upanīśads, at the same time carrying on the quest of the brāhmanas for a stable unitative principle and reacting against the paramount importance given by them to ritual acts, found a tentative answer in the conception of a Supreme Principle, identified with brahman and ātman, beyond the phenomena of the world of perception and activity, only attainable by immediate intuitive comprehension, identical with this comprehension, sole ground of all being, sole being, ultimate reality in which man submerges by knowing it and thereby escapes from saṃsāra. A reaction against this tendency of speculative thought which could only end in divorcing religion from its natural object became clearly marked in some later upanīśads<sup>8</sup> but found its most remarkable expression in the Bhagavadgītā. The Gita, without pretending to correct or supersede the 'monistic' conclusion of the upanīśads, stresses once more the necessity of action for the proper functioning of world and society and opens to all and sundry the way to release by emphasizing the personal character of the Deity who can be attained not magically or mystically through knowledge, but devoutly through bhakti.

Sankara, then, started where the upanīśads had stopped. Their ultimate answer *neti neti* is his postulate from which he develops a philosophy that explains the perfect by explaining away the imperfect. The sole real being is the absolute, everything else is unreal, sprung from an inexplicable imagination which itself is neither real nor unreal. There is no room here for reason, let alone emotion. Action is purposeless, religion impossible, there is nothing but knowledge. Against this there is again a reaction, born from the same need as was felt by the poet of the Gita, the need to take into account common sense and common experience, common religion and common God. There is indeed a striking parallelism between the Gītā's reaction against the monism of the upanīśads and Viśiṣṭādvaita's reaction against the monism of Advaita. Just as the Gītā seeks to reconcile — within orthodox Brahmanism — monism and theism, stresses the importance of ritual acts and upholds the claims of emotional religion, so Viśiṣṭādvaita seeks to reconcile — within orthodox Vedānta — unity and distinctness in the universe, stresses the importance of acts prescribed by the śāstras and upholds the claims of the religious emotions felt by the devout believer in relation to a personal God. However, just as Advaita brought only

<sup>8</sup> esp. ĆvetUp., on R.'s indebtedness to this text, cf. Kumarappa, p. 207 f.



a certain tendency of the upanishads to its logical conclusion, so did Viśiṣṭādvaita elaborate only a certain, though most important, tendency of the Gītā. Henceforth there is no tentativeness, no side-by-side, no fluency of opposites; the positions are clear-cut, the conclusions decisive, the truths definitive. Groping speculation and poetical inspiration have given way to well-defined systems.

## II

This remarkable parallelism between certain tendencies in the Bhagavadgītā and in Viśiṣṭādvaita naturally leads to the question if the tenets of the Gītā have influenced Rāmānuja's system, and if so, to what extent. It is not easy to give a complete answer to the question. Generally speaking, of course, the answer is an emphatic yes; but as soon as we start to investigate the exact manner in which this influence was exerted and precisely to what extent any direct influence is perceptible, we meet with difficulties. For it is impossible to distinguish between Rāmānuja as the independent and original thinker who created a philosophical system and who in his philosophic solitude could have been influenced directly by the Gītā, and Rāmānuja as the faithful Vaiṣṇava who succeeded Yāmuna at the temple of Śrīraṅga and who from his boyhood lived in a devout *milieu* where the tradition of centuries of Vaiṣṇavite sentiments, conceptions and mythology was interwoven with advaitic illusionism and monism, pāñcarātric cosmology and bhāgavata mysticism. In this *milieu* the teachings of the Gītā played traditionally an important rôle, and any influence they exercised on Rāmānuja must have been indirect, often unrecognizable, expressing itself in a spirit of religion and devotional actions rather than in a clear system of ethical and metaphysical truths. More than anything it was this spirit which formed Rāmānuja and which in due time would be reformed by him.

Philosophically speaking, tradition was adrift. After the great revival of the Ālwārs and the new religious fervour which stirred the South-Indian Vaiṣṇavas, the Aṣṭāgīyas could no longer acquiesce in a sterile sectarianism in which the exalted thoughts of the ecstasies would eventually drift off and vanish, no more than they could acquiesce in the not less sterile Vedāntic system of Śaṅkara which threatened to cut their thinkers off from the revivifying inspiration of personal religiosity.

It was the sentiment of bhakti in which Indian, and especially

Vaisnavite, religiosity had expressed itself of old,<sup>9</sup> and it was this bhakti, grown richer and deeper in the course of time,<sup>10</sup> which at all costs should be saved. This bhakti, a completely unintellectual devotion, a continuous flow of emotional religiosity, ranging from the worship of idols to the most exalted mysticism of love for and surrender to the supreme Deity, and as such an essentially theistic spirituality, pervaded and animated the religious life of the Vaisnavas, ever since it had found its superb expression in the poetry of the Gita, and possibly even before. The tradition of bhakta theism, side by side with a more or less upanishad-inspired monism, was continued by popular texts like the Visnu- and Bhagavatapurana and by the āgamas of the Pāñcarātra which coupled the cosmogonic doctrines of the Samkhya with the ancient devotion of Nārāyaṇa.<sup>11</sup> The typically Vaisnavite doctrine of avatāra widened the scope of man's religious possibilities. At the same time the orthodox Karmamīmāṃsā with its exclusive attention for ritual action persisted, although the actions as such were no longer recognized as the only aim but were given a subordinate place in man's progress to salvation.

All these currents of religious belief existed since the Gita side by side, and all of them exerted influence on Ramanuja. But it is hard to say what was the influence which the Gita, in which most of them can be found, exerted on them. The extraordinary popularity of the Gita should not make us forget that it was just one of the texts in which certain religious and 'philosophical' trends expressed themselves in passing. Its popularity grew with the influence of these trends themselves. I think we may say that many tenets of Ramanuja's system were not so much directly inspired by the Gita than by the very undercurrent of popular religiosity by which the Gītā itself had been inspired.

But in the meantime the Gita had become an authoritative text and every thinker who attempted to justify the devotional theism of the Vaisnavas against the monistic doctrines of advaitic Vedānta could find in it his authority. Even Sankara could not pass the Gita by but had to demonstrate that his system was perfectly in keeping with the purport of that celebrated text.<sup>12</sup> But Sankara's interpretations were dangerous,

<sup>9</sup> " la bhakti est la forme spécifiquement hindoue du sentiment religieux que l'on peut retrouver et que l'on retrouvera toujours dans tout culte et toute secte, quels qu'ils soient. Lamotte Notes p. 20

<sup>10</sup> for a historic survey see Gonda Bhakti

<sup>11</sup> on Pāñcarātra see O. Schrader Introduction to Pāñcarātra Madras 1916

<sup>12</sup> on Śaṅkara's commentary on the G see H. Faddegon Śaṅkara's Gītābhāṣya toegelicht en beoordeeld thesis Leyden 1906

he interrupted the continuity of religious thought as it had developed since the Gītā by returning directly to the monism of the older upaniṣads. And by erecting a clear-cut system he provoked automatically the opposition of all Vedāntins who would not exclude from philosophy the rich inspiration of religion. To the challenge of Śaṅkara's system they could only respond by another, more synthetic, system.

It was Yānuja who laid the foundations of such a system. In his *Siddhitraya*<sup>13</sup> he demonstrated that the ātman had an individual existence apart from Īśvara, the supreme personal Deity, and, borrowing his arguments from Nyāya and Sāṃkhya, maintained the separate existence of God as the cause and of the conscient ātmans and the phenomenal world as effects. Besides he composed a summary of the Gītā in which he set forth that its principal object is to teach bhakti as the sole means of attaining God, thereby opening the possibility that the Sāṃkhyan dualism of God, souls and matter, which still persisted in his doctrine, might be solved in a higher unity. It was left to Rāmānuja to build a synthetic system on both foundations.<sup>14</sup>

The frame-work of Rāmānuja's system is the great conception of śarīraśarīrībhāva, the doctrine that God stands to the world of ātman and prakṛti in the relation of soul to body which forms its indissoluble attribute. This doctrine satisfied the demands of philosophy; but religion demands more. It demands a way out of the bondage of embodied life to salvation in release. And to satisfy this demand Rāmānuja expounded the teaching of the Gītā coherently with the tenets of Viśiṣṭādvaita.

Now the Gītā exerts direct influence. It is not only the text whose teachings have imperceptibly found their way to purāṇa and āgama, to the every-day life of temple and hermitage, but also the authoritative smṛti text whose prestige should warrant the workable truths of Viśiṣṭādvaita. The position of the Gītā as an authoritative text is an ambiguous one. It is called an upaniṣad, but forming part of itihāsa it is smṛti, albeit a smṛti which has more prestige than many a śruti text. What does the Gītā mean to Rāmānuja? Being smṛti<sup>15</sup> its task is to support the śruti, that is to clarify the purport of the Vedas — which

<sup>13</sup> edited by S. Rāma Miśra Čāstrī in the Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series, Benares 1900, kindly sent me on loan by the India Office Library, Comm. Rel. Office, London; discussed by Dasgupta, III, pp. 138-155.

<sup>14</sup> It would be interesting to study the exact relation between the views of the *Siddhitraya* and those of the *Čribhāṣya*; too little is still known about the early history of Viśiṣṭādvaita.

<sup>15</sup> that the G. is smṛti for R. appears from many instances, e.g. ČBh. 1,1,1 p. 65 (Th. p. 86).

is already known — by means of the teachings of those sages who have complete knowledge of the Vedas and their contents and who have in virtue of their own efforts arrived at an intuitive understanding of the true meaning of the Vedas<sup>16</sup> Therefore, it necessarily must be in accord with *śruti*. A quotation of the Gīta can never suffice to prove a point without the corroboration of *śruti*<sup>17</sup> But not seldom the meaning of *śruti* is made to agree with the Gīta so that the Gītā might agree with *śruti*<sup>18</sup> It is God himself who chants the Gīta, and God is omniscient so that his teaching needs be true<sup>19</sup> We may remember that Rāmānuja has written a complete commentary on the Gītā but none on the *upaniṣads*, not even on the *Svetaśvatara* and the *Kaṭha*, and that he has contented himself with sketching in outline the manner in which the conflicting statements of the various *śrutis* should be reconciled<sup>20</sup> It is on the strength of the authority of the Gītā that he sets forth the necessity of ritual action, performed not to achieve a personal end but for the glory of God, as a first step to ultimate beatitude in the intuitive vision of God through exclusive and perfect *bhakti*, and this doctrine is the *raison d'être* of his whole system which was born from the need to account philosophically for the redeeming value of religion and devotion

On the whole we may say that it was the Gīta and all it stood for, the long tradition of love inspired theism, of devout Vaisnavism of the worship of avatars and the importance of ritual action, which provided Rāmānuja if not with the frame work of his religious philosophy, at least with its main inspiration and that it was the Gīta's doctrine of salvation which was elaborated and re-integrated in Rāmānuja's reformation of Vedānta which was thereby lifted from the 'intellectual' sphere to the plane of religion. Just as Sankara, after the decline of Buddhism, restored the continuity of Brahmanism by reaching back to the *upaniṣads*, so Rāmānuja restored the continuity of Hinduism by making room

<sup>16</sup> CBh 111 p 72 (Th p 91) *asyārthasyetihāsapurāṇābhyaṁ upabrmhanam kṛjyam ity jūdyate / upabrmhanam nāma viditasakalādatadarthānām svayogama-līmasakṛjātkṛtādatatī ārtihā nām -ākṛjāh s-a āgata-eda-ākṛjārtha yaktikaranam*

<sup>17</sup> eg in CBh 111 (Th p 78 ff) R quotes first several *śrutis* then the G and finally the VP to corroborate his view that Brahman is not *nirguṇa-* in Śankara's sense

<sup>18</sup> a striking example is the *vedana upāsana* and *dhyana* of the *upaniṣads* which is equated with the *bhakti* of the G. cf also GBh ad 7

<sup>19</sup> cf GBh. 212 and 132

<sup>20</sup> viz in the Ved and CBh 111 (Th p 138 ff) in the CBh. the G is quoted not less than 140 times following in number immediately after BAU and ChUp

in Vedānta for the Bhagavadgītā. This is already amply proved by the Śrībhāṣya; but by composing the Gītābhāṣya Rāmānuja gave full expression to the cardinal significance of the Gītā in Vedānta.

So Rāmānuja acquitted himself of the task left to him by Yāmuna, and, we may add, entirely in Yāmuna's spirit. For Yāmuna left his successor not only a task, but also a scheme, the Gītārthasamgraha.

### *Rāmānuja's indebtedness to Yāmuna's Gītārthasamgraha*

Several authors contend that Rāmānuja was in a large measure indebted to Yāmuna's Gītārthasamgraha for his interpretations of the Gītā,<sup>21</sup> but, as far as I know, no attempt has as yet been made to determine the exact measure in which Rāmānuja was influenced by his predecessor.

Yāmuna's GAS<sup>22</sup> is a very concise summary of the G in 32 ślokas. It may conveniently be divided into four parts, 1 the doctrine of the G (st 1); 2 the subject-matter of the three satkas into which Y divides the eighteen Lectures (st 2-4), 3 the subject-matter of the eighteen Lectures separately (st 5-22), 4 definitions and discussions of the main points of the G (st 23-32).

We do not exaggerate when we say that practically all the salient features of the GBh are contained in Y's scheme. Rāmānuja himself leaves no doubt as to his indebtedness to Yāmuna: he not only dedicates his commentary to Yāmuna with the significant remark that he owes everything to his illustrious predecessor,<sup>23</sup> but he also quotes some of the ślokas of the GAS and most important of all, makes a point of using Yāmuna's own words, as often as the occasion arises.

The following notes may suffice to illustrate this.

1 The doctrine of the G according to Y: svadharmajñānavairāgya-sadhyabhaktyekagocarah Nārāyaṇaḥ param Brahma (vs 1), and to R: paramabrahmabhūtaḥ Nārāyaṇo svavīśvameva jñānākarmānugrhitam bhaktiyogam avatara yāmāsa,<sup>24</sup> and Gītāsāstrasya sārārtho bhakti-yogah (18,0).

<sup>21</sup> e.g. Radhakrishnan, G p 17, Srinivasachari, VA p 512, and Kumarappa, p 144.

<sup>22</sup> text and translation of the Gītārthasamgraha in Appendix.

<sup>23</sup> in the title of the Vedarthasamgraha we hear a courteous echo of that of the Gītārthasamgraha.

<sup>24</sup> This passage in Intr, at a √tr is borrowed from GAS 5.

2 R borrows from Y the tripartition of the eighteen Lectures in 3 satkas, a 1-6, b 7-12, c 13-18

a 16 Y jñānakarmātmike nisthe yugalakṣe ātmīnubhūtiśiddhyai the (vs 2), and R prathamēnādhyaśatkena ātmajñānapūrvakakarmānusthānasādhyaṁ praptuḥ pratyagatmano yāthātmyadarsanam uktam (7,0), R uses throughout Y's term -nisthā<sup>25</sup> where G has -yoga- in jñāna- and karmayoga- ātmadarsana- corresponds to Y's ātmadrsti- (vs 25), Y's yoga- to R's "contemplation of the ātman" (ātmadarśana-, -avalokana-), cf 253 and 68-72, 6, 27-29

b 7-12 Y bhagavattattvayāthātmavaptiśiddhaye jñānakarmābhivartyo bhaktiyogah, and R jñānakarmānugihitam bhaktiyogam (Intr), and madhyame ca paramaprap, abhūtabhagavattattvayāthātmya-jñānapūrvakakāntikātyantikabhaktiyoganisthā pratipāditā (Intr and 13,0)

c 13-18 Y supplementary discussion of 1 pradhāna 2 puruṣa, 3 vyakta, 4 īśvara, 5 karma, 6 dhī, 7 bhakti, and R uparitanasatke (1) prakṛti- (2) puruṣa- (3) tatsamśargaprapañca- (4) īśvarayāthātmya- (5) karma- (6) jñāna- (7) bhaktiśvarūpatadupādānaprakārās ca satkadavayoditā viśodhyante (13,0)

3 R follows in his own abstracts of the Lectures the summary of the GAS often to the point of literalness

So, e.g., Y prasāṅgāt śvasvabhavoktiḥ karmano 'karmatāśya ca / bhedā jñānasya mātātmyam caturthādhyaḥ ucyate // (st 8) and R caturthe karmayogasya kartavyatam dradhayitvantargatajñānatayāśyaiva jñānayogākāratām pradarsya karmayogasvarūpam tadbhedāḥ karmayoge jñānāmśasyaiva prādhanyam cocyate, prasāṅgāc ca bhagavadavatārayāthātmyam ucyate (4,0), and Y (1) svayāthātmyam (2) prakṛtyāśya tirodhiḥ (3) saranagatiḥ / (4) bhaktabhedah (5) prabuddhasya śraisthyam saptama ucyate // (st 11), and R . saptame tāvad (1) upāśyabhūtaparamapurusaśvarūpayāthātmyam (2) prakṛtyā tirodhānam (3) tannivṛttaye bhagavatprapattir (4) upāsakavidhābhedo (5) jñāninaḥ śraisthyam cocyate (7,0), and Y svakalyānagunānantyakṛtsnāśādhinātāmataḥ / bhaktyutpattivivṛddhvarthā vistirṇā daśamoditā // (st 14) and R bhaktyutpattaye tadvivṛddhaye ca bhagavato kalyānagunaganānantyam kṛtsnasya jagatas tatpravartiyatvam ca prapañcyate (10,0), and Y. (1) dehasvarūpam (2) ātmāptihetur (3) ātmaviśodhanam / (4) bandhahetur (5) vivekaś ca trayodasa udīryate // (st 17), and R : trayodase (1) dehātmanoh svarūpam dehayāthātmyasodhanam

<sup>25</sup> borrowed, of course, from G 3,3

(2) dehaviyuktātmaprāptiyupāya- (3) viviktātmasvarūpasamsodhanam (4) tathīvidhasyātmanas cācitsambandhanahetus (5) tato vivekānu-sandhānaprakāras cocyate (13,0); and, finally, Y (1) īsvare kartṛtā-buddhiḥ (2) sattvopādeyatāntime / (3) svakarmaparīnamaś ca (4) sāstrasārārtha ucyate // (st 22), and R (1) bhagavatī sarveśvare ca sarvakarmanām kartṛtvānusamdhānam (2) sattvagunasyāvaśyopādeya-tvam (3) karmanam paramapurūsārādhanaabhūtānām paramapurusa-prāptinirvartanaprakārah (4) . Gītāsastrasya sārārtho bhaktiyo-gah (18,0)<sup>26</sup>

4 Most of the definitions and discussions with which Y deals in GAS 23-32 return in one form or the other throughout the GBh. In fact, there is hardly a word in Y's summary which does not reappear in the corresponding context of the GBh in the same or a slightly different form.

To Rāmānuja's free use of Yāmuna's terminology corresponds a not less striking fidelity to the main points of the GAS. Both Y and R regard jñāna- and karmayoga — whatever their exact relation<sup>27</sup> — only as preparatory stages: they result in the "contemplation of the ātman", but not in the attainment of God himself. God can only be attained through bhakti, to which the former disciplines of jñāna and karman are the indispensable means, and both agree that this doctrine is the essence of the Gita. As to their views on the subject-matter of the separate Lectures, the above quotations will sufficiently prove that they almost literally concur.

On the whole we may say that Yāmuna provided Rāmānuja with the frame-work of his Gītābhāṣya. Yāmuna established the general sense of the Gita and left to Rāmānuja the task of adapting detailed interpretations to the general lines sketched by him in the Gītārthasamgraha. We may even regard the GAS as a satisfactory index to the Gītābhāṣya. Sometimes, however, the text of the GAS is not clear enough to allow a definite translation and we have to invoke the aid of Rāmānuja's paraphrases to understand its exact meaning. But then the concise character of the GAS makes it difficult to find out whether Rāmānuja explains the text in the sense of Yāmuna. For example, in GAS st 8 we cannot be sure that Yāmuna considered akarmatā (corresponding to akarman- in G 4,18) to mean knowledge and

<sup>26</sup> these examples may suffice: the summaries of all 18 Lectures are repeated by R. with greater or lesser fidelity in his own abstracts at the beginning of each Lecture or the next one.

<sup>27</sup> see Chapter IV.

jñanasya mahātmyam to signify the 'importance of the component of knowledge in action' as R. interprets it, nor are we sure that in st 6 Yāmuna meant by yoga "contemplation of the atman" Personally speaking, I am under the impression that Yāmuna attached more importance to jñanayoga as a separate way to salvation than Rāmānuja does, but to my mind it is impossible to deduce a positive conclusion from the insufficient data of the Gītārthasamgraha<sup>28</sup>

Many of Ramanuja's ideas seem to derive directly from the Gītārthasamgraha, for instance, that acts — which always are ritual acts — are propitiations of God,<sup>29</sup> that the contemplation of the atman is ancillary to the attainment of God through bhakti,<sup>30</sup> and that there are three groups of bhaktas the an-varyārthins, the kaivalyārthins and the jñānins, but that only the last attain God<sup>31</sup>

Summing up we may say that before Rāmānuja set himself to the task of commenting on every verse of the Bhagavadgītā most of the interpretations which found their way to his bhāṣya were already accepted among South-Indian Vaiṣnavas of Yāmuna's school. But as Rāmānuja in his śrībhāṣya proves himself to be such an original and subtle thinker, we may safely assume, though direct evidence is lacking, that in his Gītābhāṣya, too, the views of his predecessors and co-religionists not only found a more systematical expression, but were also rearranged and reinterpreted by his original and devout genius

### III

Whereas there is direct evidence that the Vedārthasamgraha was written before the śrībhāṣya,<sup>32</sup> the relative date of the Gītābhāṣya has not yet been established. Tradition is silent about it.<sup>33</sup> The śrībhāṣya nowhere quotes the Gītābhāṣya, nor does the Gītābhāṣya ever quote the śrībhāṣya. So, if we are to ascertain the relation between Rāmānuja's

<sup>28</sup> On the GAS compare also Srinivasachari, VA p 372 ff, in my opinion, however, there is no sufficient evidence to prove that in the GAS "the last (śaṅka) sums up the whole truth and insists on absolute self-surrender (= *prapatti* or the *saranāgati* of vs 11) to the Lord as the only means of salvation" (o.c. p. 372), nor that 'the last chapter insists on *saranagati* or surrender to the Lord as the supreme means of mokṣa' (o.c. p. 374), cf my remarks on *prapatti* with R. in Chapter IV

<sup>29</sup> GAS 25, at the root of this conception is G 18,46

<sup>30</sup> GAS 26

<sup>31</sup> GAS 27-28.

<sup>32</sup> R. refers twice to his Vedārthasamgraha in CBh 1,1,1, viz Th. pp 78 and 138.

<sup>33</sup> cf Govindācārya, Life of Rāmānuja, p 134-136, Srinivasachari, VA., p 517



commentary on the Sūtras and that on the Gītā at all, we shall have to refer to internal evidence.

There can be no doubt that the ŚBh. and GBh. are written by the same author. Tradition is positive, and, indeed, the very terminology of practically every line of the GBh. reminds us very strongly of that of the ŚBh., more so in fact than the terminology of the Vedārtha-saṃgraha does. R. not only uses the same expressions and definitions for fundamental concepts of his system, but he also uses literally the same terms when speaking of matters of detail in both commentaries. E.g., *prabalapramāṇabādhitatvena* occurs in the same form (and the same context!) in ŚBh. 1,1,1, p. 8 (Th. p. 13) and GBh. 2,12; when speaking of the Vedas it is said in the GBh. 2,45 that they are *mātā-piṭṛsahasrebhyaḥ* 'pi vatsalataratayā pravṛttāḥ, and in ŚBh. 3,3,39 (Th. p. 662) *mātāpiṭṛsahasrebhyaḥ* 'pi vatsalataraṃ śāstram. These instances, which illustrate the direct relation between both texts (in which they occur only once), could be augmented.

A certain method of investigating the relation between both commentaries consists in studying the quotations of the Gītā in the ŚBh. as well as those of the Sūtras in the GBh. If we should discover some difference between the interpretations given in either text of the same stanza and the same sūtra, we may be justified in seeking in that difference a criterion by which we can decide on the exact relation of both texts.

### 1. *The Gītā quotations in the Śrībhāṣya.*

The Gītā is, after the BAU. and ChUp. the most quoted text in the Śrībhāṣya (some 140 times). As far as I can see, the stanzas of the Gītā quoted are interpreted exactly in the same way as they are in the GBh. Frequently, of course, the stanzas are quoted in another connection in the ŚBh. than they are in the GBh.: they serve to illustrate a point of the demonstration of the ŚBh.,<sup>34</sup> so that no more can be said than that the general trend of the interpretations is the same as in the GBh. But in dealing with some stanzas R. is obliged to enter into detail; in all these cases his explanations in the ŚBh. strikingly concur with those in the GBh.

For instance, in ŚBh. 1,1,21 (Th. p. 241) G. 4,6 is quoted . . . *prakṛtiṃ svām adhiṣṭhāya saṃbhavāmy ātmamāyayā*, which is explained:

<sup>34</sup> so G. 2,12; 7,6; 10,8; 10,20; 10,39; 12,17; 14,4 and 15,18 are quoted to corroborate the view that consciousness of an individual self persists in release (GBh. 1,1,1, Th. p. 71).

prakṛti svabhāvaḥ / svam eva svabhāvam āsthāya, na samsārinam  
 svabhāvam ity arthah / ātmamāyayeti svasamkalparūpena jñānenety  
 arthah "māyā vayunam jñānam" iti jñānaparyāyam api naighantukā  
 adhiyate, cf GBh prakṛtim svabhāvam / svam eva svabhāvam adhi-  
 sthāya svenaiva rūpena svecchayā sambhavāmīty arthah ātmamāya-  
 yātma-jñānena / "māyā vayunam jñānam" iti<sup>35</sup> jñānaparyāya n'tra māyāśā-  
 bdah In ŚBh 1,1,1, p 102 (Th p 125) commenting on G 7,14 māyā  
 is equated with prakṛti because it is called gunamayī, a discussion of  
 the meaning of māyā precedes this quotation naḥi sarvatra māyā-  
 śabdo mithyāvisayah / āsuraraksasāstrādīsu satyesv eva māyāśabda-  
 prayogāt / yathoktam (VP 1,19,20 is quoted), ato māyāśabdo vicitrā-  
 rthaśargakarābhīdhāyī, cf GBh asyā (sc prakṛtyā) māyāśabdavācya-  
 tvam āsuraraksasāstrādīnām iva vicitrakāryakaratvena,<sup>36</sup> then the  
 same smṛti (VP 1,19,20) is quoted, and R proceeds ato māyāśabdo  
 na mithyārthavācī, this theme is further elaborated<sup>37</sup> and it is con-  
 cluded that the primary sense of māyā is "miracle-working or illusion-  
 creating influence" (this miracle and illusion being in itself real), and  
 the secondary sense is "the illusion created" Another instance is ŚBh  
 4,2,20 (Th p 742) where G 8 23 is commented upon yatra kāle tv  
 iti kalasabdah kalabhimānidevatatīvāhikaparāh, agnyādeh kālatvāsam-  
 bhavah, cf GBh atra kalasabdo margasyāhahprabhṛtisamvatsarānta-  
 kālābhīmānidevatābhūyastayā mārgopalaksanārthah Finally ŚBh 1,1,1  
 p 118 (Th p 140) ad G 14,3 jagadyonibhūtam mahad brahma ma-  
 dīyam prakṛtyākhyam bhūtasūksmam acidvastu yasmims cetanākhyam  
 garbham samyojayāmi / tato matkrtāc cidacitsamsargād devādisthāva-  
 rāntānām acinmīsrānām sarvabhūtanām sambhavo bhavātīty arthah; cf  
 GBh acetanaprakṛtyā bhogaksetrabhūtaya bhoktrvargapūñjabhū-  
 tām cetanaprakṛtim<sup>38</sup> samyojayāmīty arthah / tatas: tasmāt prakṛti-  
 dvayasamyogān matsamkalpakṛtāt sarvabhūtanām sambhavo bhavati

These instances may suffice to show that the interpretations in GBh  
 and SBh of certain Gītā stanzas often literally concur, so much so that  
 I think we may assume direct borrowing But if both texts agree so  
 completely, it is impossible to conclude which explanation was written  
 down first Still it should be remarked that the GBh enlarges more

<sup>35</sup> V comments from a Nighantū

<sup>36</sup> V having the above GBh passage in mind adds satyesv āsuraraksasā-  
 strādīsu māyāśabdaprayoge na mithyārthanibandhana itī bhūtaḥ

<sup>37</sup> i.e. by adducing the instance of the illusionist (māyādarīn-) who suggest to  
 a person a certain idea (buddhi) which in itself is real enough the same instance  
 is adduced in shorter form in GBh 1,1,1, p 56 (Th 75)

<sup>38</sup> or the jīva-bhūtaprakṛti of G 7,5

on the interpretations of 7,14, 8,23 and 14,3 than the śBh does GBh 7, 14 gives an important amplification of R's statement in the sBh on māya and elucidates his views sBh ad G 8,23 is too brief to be altogether clear, only by comparing the GBh we learn exactly why kala- is used in the sense of murga- In itself, however, the concurrence of GBh with sBh provides no sufficient evidence to conclude definitely which text is anterior The only conclusion is that before the sBh and the GBh were written down R's interpretation of the Gita, even in detail, was fixed

## 2 Sūtra quotations in the Gītābhāṣya

With the Sūtra quotations in the GBh the matter stands differently Several times the Vedantasūtras are quoted (ten times in total), but only in a few cases the sense of the sūtra concerned is commented upon Taking into consideration the importance of the Sūtras in the Vedānta and the existence of Sankara's commentary, whose authoritativeness for the Vedāntins is proved time and again by Ramanuja's polemic violence<sup>39</sup> it is a priori improbable that R' would have referred to the Sūtras in corroboration of his Gita interpretations if he had had no reason to consider his own views on these vital texts to be sufficiently known to his fellow-philosophers, only after having composed his bhāṣya on the Sūtras he could refrain as he does from commenting in detail on the Sūtras to which he refers

The interpretation of the Sūtras quoted in the GBh is exactly the same as that in the sBh In some cases, again, the agreement is so literal that we must assume direct borrowing For instance VS 2 1,34<sup>40</sup> is quoted in GBh 4,14, in the same context both sBh and GBh quote VP 1,4,51-52, the last line of which (*niyate tapasām srestha svasaktiā vastu vastutām*) is explained svakarmanāiva devādivastutaprāptiḥ, and svagatapracinākarṇāśaktiāiva hi devādivastubhavam upaniyate respectively VS 2 3 41<sup>41</sup> is quoted in GBh 18,14-15, in sBh this sūtra is introduced nanv evam vidhimisedhasāstrānarthakyam prasajyetety uk-tam tatrāha (follows sūtra) and in GBh (after quotation of 2,3,40)<sup>42</sup> nanv evam paramatmayatte jīvātmanah kartṛtve jīvātmā karmāny

<sup>39</sup> for a comparative study of R. and Ç on the VS see VS Ghate Le Vedānta Etude sur les Brahma sūtras et leurs cinq commentaires thesis Paris 1918

<sup>40</sup> *śaṅkṣāṇāṁ śaṅkṣāṇāṁ na, śāpekṣāṇāṁ ai*

<sup>41</sup> *śaṅkṣāṇāṁ śāpekṣāṇāṁ in śhīlāpratiśiddhāśāṁ śāpekṣāṇāṁ*

<sup>42</sup> *śaṅkṣāṇāṁ śāpekṣāṇāṁ*

anīyojyo bhavatīti vidhimsedhasāstrāṇy anarthakam syuh / idam apī codyam sutrakarena parihrtam (follows 23,41), this sutra is commented on in SBh sarvasu kriyasu purusena krtam prayatnam udjogam apeksyantaryamīparamatma tadanumatidanena pravartayati, paramatmanumatini antarenasya pravrttir nopapadyate, and in GBh paramatmanā dattais tadadharais ca karanakalevaradibhis<sup>43</sup> tadahitasaktibhiḥ svayam ca jivatma tadadharas tadahita-aktiḥ san karmanispattayā svecchaya karanadyadhīsthanakaram prayatnam carabhate / tadantara-vasthūtaḥ paramatma svanumatidanena tam pravartayatīti jivasyaḥ svabuddhyaiva pravrttihetutvam asti. Here more than in SBh full stress is laid upon the intention of the individual atman, but this is only one aspect of the question the problem how God can permit sin in the atman is not touched upon<sup>44</sup> In SBh the relation between God and self and their agency is illustrated by the example of the joint property of two persons which cannot be disposed of by one person save with the permission of the other. In GBh, too the relation is illustrated with an instance but as in the Gita not the relation between the agency of God and self but that of all six factors which cause an action is under discussion an entirely different example is provided, there, too, it is especially the responsibility of the individual atman which is emphasized. The discussion of this sutra in GBh, which only throws light on one aspect of the problem may lead us to assume that R deliberately avoided touching on God's relation to the evil created by man an aspect which instantly calls for attention, this aspect is however fully dealt with in the SBh whereas the GBh more fully discusses the atman's responsibility. May we assume, then, that R here implicitly refers to his demonstration in the SBh?

There is another, but dubious, indication that the GBh is posterior to the SBh. In his detailed commentary on G 2,12 Rāmānuja refutes the objection of an advaitin that the bheda-doctrine implied by this stanza might be a case of badhitanuvrtti,<sup>45</sup> the persistence of an erroneous notion which has already been sublated. R shows by three examples that the argument is not appropriate, these examples are *mirage and water, mirror and real person, one moon and double moon*. Now it is remarkable that the sequence of these examples exactly corresponds to

<sup>43</sup> sc. the body senses fivefold vital air, R's interpretation of G 184 *śhṛīḥhāna, karana* and *ceṣṭā*

<sup>44</sup> as it is in GBh 2341 where it occupies the greater part of R's commentary (Th. p. 557-558)

<sup>45</sup> cf. also GBh. 111, p. 7 (Th. p. 12) and Varadachari, Theory of knowledge p. 83

that in which they appear in the series of erroneous, though to some extent real, notions summed up in ŚBh. 1,1,1, p. 98 ff. (Th. p. 120 ff.), viz. silver and mother-of-pearl; dream and reality; white seen as yellow; crystal seen as red; *mirage and water*; firebrand; *mirror and real person*; mistaken direction; *one moon and double moon*. Unless one would consider this a curious coincidence, it creates the impression that R. went through his list in the ŚBh. to see in which case the objection of his adversary would hold good and selected three instances to incorporate in his refutation.

Moreover, a number of passages in GBh., dealing with fundamental concepts of Viśiṣṭādvaita, not only presuppose a short *exposé* like the Vedārthasaṃgraha,<sup>46</sup> but also the detailed demonstrations of the Śrībhāṣya. For example, R.'s commentary on G. 2,12 is only comprehensible when seen against the background of his Great Siddhānta in the Śrībhāṣya. We note in this passage that R.'s entire reasoning with regard to this important text departs from the axiomatic assumption that the Gītā is *upadeśa*-, i.e. instruction in truth; but the Gītā, however important its teaching, is only *smṛti*,<sup>47</sup> and R. would never have refuted the orthodox, upaniṣadic doctrines of advaitavāda on the strength of *smṛti* alone: his very reasoning here presupposes the scriptural evidence collected in ŚBh. 1,1,1, (Th. p. 78 ff.). The full import of his remarks on the vision of a double moon in the same passage becomes only clear when we compare them with his demonstrations in ŚBh., 1,1,1, p. 7 f and 99 (Th. p. 12 f. and 130 f.). These are only a few instances. Throughout his Gītābhāṣya Rāmānuja takes for granted certain notions of which he only treats in detail in his Śrībhāṣya.

Considering all this, the narrow relation between GBh. and ŚBh., the amplified interpretations of the GBh. where the interpretations of the ŚBh. are enlarged upon, the implicit references to the ŚBh. when Sūtras are quoted in direct corroboration of his Gītā commentary, and the a priori probability that the ŚBh., as an epoch-making commentary on a vital Vedānta text, preceded the Gītābhāṣya, in which moreover the most important viśiṣṭādvaita views, set forth in the Śrībhāṣya, are taken for granted, considering all this I feel justified in contending, though not one of the indications is in itself conclusive, that the Gītābhāṣya is posterior to the Śrībhāṣya.

<sup>46</sup> this important text has not yet been studied in detail; it would be interesting to know the relation between Ved. and GBh.

<sup>47</sup> see Chapter II.

The Gītābhāṣya is in many respects very different from either the Vedārthasaṃgraha or the Śrībhāṣya. Here Rāmānuja does not act as the independent thinker who with polemic vehemence attacks and refutes the errors of advaitavādins and bhedābhedaśāstrins and who in a concise and precise style expounds his doctrines systematically and organically, but he appears in the different rôle of commenting theologian whose views need no longer to be defended and advocated and who quietly applies them to the interpretation of every stanza. Very rarely he permits himself to polemize, and then only briefly; seldom he enlarges on the philosophical significance of the concepts in the terms of which he interprets his text. But readily he enlarges upon the devotional passages of the Gītā and then his style often approaches that of the ardent devotee who glorifies his God in fervid litanies. More than in his other works it is here the priest of the temple of Śrīraṅga who rises before our minds in the prose hymns of many passages. It is the priest who is in daily touch with God in his temple, who is familiar with the practices of ritual acts and the more exalted practices of meditation and loving representation. It is the devoted bhakta who dresses and adorns the image, who loves to dwell on the infinite perfections of the God it represents, on the beautiful shapes He assumes, the radiance of his countenance, the brilliance of his ornaments, the splendour of his attributes. Metaphysical speculation is bleached by the glorious light in which the Deity to whose service all acts should be dedicated and on whom all thoughts should be focused is revealed in the immediate visualization of bhakti.

#### IV

Rāmānuja, following Yāmuna, divides the 18 Lectures of the Bhagavadgītā into three ṣaṭkas, the last of which gives further explanations of topics already dealt with in the preceding ṣaṭkas. In the first 12 Lectures, then, the fundamental teaching of the Gītā is laid down, culminating in the essential doctrine of bhakti. The whole teaching of the Gītā is declared to be the exposition of the mumukṣu's progress to bhakti and the attainment of God. That progress is divided into two stages, the first of which, preparatory and ancillary to bhakti, is the subject-matter of Lectures 1-6.

Departing from Arjuna's dilemma, at the root of which appears to lie an ignorance of the basic truths, the Lord begins by explaining the categorical difference between body and ātman. What is a body?

A conglomeration of elements of prakṛti which has developed into a certain nature and structure, it is essentially non-spiritual or non-conscient and essentially transient Prakṛti itself, one of the three categories which make up the universe, may be eternal as such, its corporeal forms are perishable. Eternally it passes from one stage to another, from the stage of subtlety, where it is cause, to that of grossness, where it is effect, likewise its more developed forms, such as the body, pass from stage to stage, from birth to death and from death to birth, just as a clot of clay passes into the stage of jug and from that into the stage of grains. Entirely different from this non-conscient prakṛti is the ātman, an essentially spiritual and conscient principle whose essential attribute is knowledge. From time immemorial it has been implicated in saṃsāra, seemingly dying and being born with the body to which it adheres. Fundamentally, however, it is immortal and not subject to the body's vicissitudes. It only *seems* to be mortal, through a basic misconception which is the root of all evil, the misconception<sup>48</sup> that the ātman is identical with the body in which it resides. Once this misconception has been formed and struck root, the ātman is bound to the body. Though its proper nature does not really change but remains essentially aloof from the body, the ātman is involved in matter. It acquires a mock nature, that of the empirical ego particularized by its body. Once the proper nature of the ātman is no more recognized the embodied being regards the pleasures which it can derive from the body as the only pleasures within its reach. The embodied being or individual person acts upon his basic misconception in order to materialize his ambitions. But one action involves the next one, and his activity becomes a habit<sup>49</sup> and the habit becomes literally a second nature. All actions are necessarily followed by results, and these results of past acts which a person has performed by his own free will<sup>50</sup> determine his future, henceforth he is trapped in the net of saṃsāra.

So all teaching of the ways by which a person may return to the recognition of his proper nature must start with explaining this nature. Pure knowledge of what the ātman essentially is, is, however, not sufficient to break the bonds that tie the ātman to its body. This know-

<sup>48</sup> On the important notion of abhīmana in Viśiṣṭādvaita see Varadachari's interesting paper on that subject (Appendix III to his *R's Theory of Knowledge*) on the Sāṃkhya aspect of the same problem see Radhakrishnan *Ind. Phil.* II, pp. 303 ff.

<sup>49</sup> *vasana*

<sup>50</sup> see e.g. GBh. 18.13 ff. and Kumārappa's remarks p. 271 ff.

ledge must be lived, must be applied to every action and thought of the man in samsara. So the samkhye buddhih, or the knowledge of the proper nature of the atman as an entity distinct from the body, is followed by buddhiyoga, the practical application of this knowledge to every day life.

If it is activity for the sake of results that keeps the ātman in bondage to prakṛti, then the first step to the release of the ātman must be the relinquishment of the results of the acts, of all results even the rewards which man may enjoy in heaven after a virtuous life. All acts should be performed to achieve one end, the supreme end of man, Release. This release is the sole purpose of the sastras in all their various injunctions. Only by karmayoga the assiduous practice of disinterested activity in which the knowledge of the atman is integrated, one may eventually reach that exalted stage at which the atman can be perceived, for karmayoga in the above sense leads to jñānanistha and jñānanisthā leads to the contemplation of the atman or the atman's self experience.

Now what is this jñānanistha? The constant consciousness of the knowledge of the atman, which alone occupies the entire mind of the aspirant and which alone is the ground of his activity. The exact relation between karmayoga and jñānayoga is not altogether clear. From 2,54-58, where four degrees of jñānanistha (= jñānayoga) are enumerated, it would appear that jñānanistha is a discipline of concentration: the mind has to be focused on the atman and the senses withdrawn from their objects, so that there seems no room for 'action', but in 72 it is explicitly stated that the *sthāpaprāñā* or *jñānanistha* is characterized by his firm devotion to disinterested activity or karmayoga. The problem is further discussed in 3,1 ff, but whereas according to 2,53 karmayoga leads to jñānanisthā and the latter to the contemplation of the ātman, it is now said that jñānanistha presupposes karmayoga, and further on, in 3,4, that for several reasons karmayoga is preferable to jñānayoga, even for one entitled to jñānayoga, nay, that jñānayoga is physically impossible (4,8) and that only a released atman can refrain from acting (4,17 f). So in 3,35 *sreyān svadharmaṁ vigunah paradharmat svanuṣṭhitāt, sva* is made to refer to any person conjoined with prakṛti and *para-* to a released atman.<sup>51</sup> In several passages (3,34, 37) jñānayoga is strongly advised against. Then the accent is shifted, it is said that karmayoga itself includes knowledge (4,18 ff), that knowledge is the most important aspect of karmayoga (4,33-34). The same problem of the exact relation between both nisthās is again tackled in 5,1 ff: here

<sup>51</sup> but cf. GBh. 2,47



karmayoga and jñānayoga are equally autonomous means of attaining beatitude, i.e. the beatitude of the ātman's self-experience, and they are optional; immediately thereafter jñānayoga is declared impossible without karmayoga. Finally, the yoga described in 5,27-28 which is the last step to the ātman's self-experience, is called the head, or the crown, of karmayoga.

How to account for these apparently conflicting statements? No doubt it is principally the ambiguity of the Gītā itself which returns here: the poet of the Gītā did not venture to set aside the time-honoured 'path of knowledge' of the upaniṣads, however partial he were to the 'path of disinterested action'.<sup>52</sup> It seems to me that Rāmānuja attempted to reconcile both methods of the Gītā, and starting from the emphatically preferable karmayoga tried to reinterpret jñānayoga. By introducing an element of jñāna into karmayoga itself, both disciplines could be stated in the terms of a continuity: jñānayoga is now no longer a separate way — as such it is repeatedly condemned — but an advanced stage of karmayoga. From Rāmānuja's point of view karmayoga has two 'aspects', knowledge and action. That knowledge is originally the mediate, more or less 'abstract' knowledge of the ātman, corresponding with the *sāṃkhye buddhiḥ* of the Gītā. This knowledge is acted upon: interested action becomes disinterested action. Gradually (the process may require several lives<sup>53</sup>) knowledge and action interact more directly; knowledge, becoming more and more integrated in action, is concretized, action is spiritualized and interiorized, until at last both culminate in Yoga where the ātman is recognized, karmayoga terminates in jñānayoga and the mediate, abstract knowledge is completely concretized in immediate intuitive perception (*sākṣātkāra*).<sup>54</sup>

So both karmayoga and jñānayoga culminate in Yoga or the Contemplation of the ātman, the immediate cognition, or rather recognition, of the ātman in oneself and all others. There are four degrees or stages, 1. the recognition of similar ātmans in all beings, which all have the

<sup>52</sup> I may refer to Edgerton, Gītā II, pp. 62 ff.

<sup>53</sup> cf. GBh. 3,35.

<sup>54</sup> essentially the same view in YID. 7, p. 62 karmayogo nāmopadeśāḥ jīva-parayāthātmyajñānaśaktyanusāreṇa phala-saṅgarahita-karmaviśeṣaḥ /... ayam tu jīva-gata-kalmaṣāpanayanadvārā jñānayogam utpādyā tadvārā sākṣād vā (or, rather, v.l. sākṣātkāra-) bhaktyutpādako bhavati / jñānayogo nāma karmayogān nirmalāntahkaranasyeśvaraśeṣatvena prakṛtivyuktasvātmacintāviśeṣaḥ. For a modern interpretation of karma- and jñānayoga, tacitly along R.'s lines, see Srinivasachari, V.A. ch. XIII and XIV (pp. 320 ff.) and Gītā, ch. IV and V (pp. 50 ff.).

same form, knowledge, which is their essential quality, 2. the recognition of similarity of God and ātman, 3. the persistence of recognition not only in Yoga but in everyday life, and 4., the highest stage, the acting upon this recognition by never more distinguishing between one's own ātman and the ātmans of others.<sup>55</sup>

But this lofty end, which as such already means salvation,<sup>56</sup> is not the end of man's possibilities; on the contrary, it is only a beginning, a necessary beginning of the attainment of the Supreme End, God himself, 6,47 marks the transition from the first to the second saṅka and announces the subject-matter of Lectures 7-12: bhakti as the sole means of attaining God.

What is bhakti? It is man's participating of God, at once 'intellectual' and devotional.<sup>57</sup> It is the constant memorization of the ātman's total subservience to God, inspired and animated by a perfect love of worship in which the knowledge of God as the possessor of all perfections, as the merciful saviour and as the sole cause of the universe completely terminates. It culminates in a mystic ecstasy of love so ardent that the aspirant cannot live for a moment separated from God: all his happiness depends on his contact with God; his most humble act is an expression of his all-pervading love for God.

Rāmānuja's views on bhakti, as they appear in the Gītābāṣya, are essentially those of the śrībhāṣya;<sup>58</sup> but in his commentary on the Gītā he loves to dwell upon the devotional and emotional aspects of the 'continuous representation of God'. He sums these aspects up in his commentary ad 9,34 "in which God declares what bhakti essentially is": "Focus your mind constantly, uninterrupted like a flow of oil,<sup>59</sup> on Me, the Paramount Sovereign, antagonistic to all evil and solely comprising all that is good, on Me, the Omniscient, whose every will is truth, the sole cause of the universe, the Supreme Brahman, the Supreme Person,

<sup>55</sup> Srinivasachari, Gītā, ch. V, pp. 76 ff.

<sup>56</sup> There is no doubt that R. considered that ātmāvalokana means release of the soul (following Yāmuna, ĀS. p. 1 *manmatam hi sarvasamayesu ātmajñānam nīhreyasahetur iti*), but the relation between release in kaivalya and in bhakti is not clear; cf. Srinivasachari, Gītā, pp. 90 f.

<sup>57</sup> for a systematic description of bhakti in R. I refer to Lacombe, ASV. pp. 363 ff.; on bhakti generally see Gonda, Bhakti; R. does not appear to make the later distinction between *bhājana*- and *bhakti*-, see Gonda, o.c. p. 647; *bhājana* is used once (9,30) to explain bhakti.

<sup>58</sup> compare e.g. GBh. 18,65 *vedanopāsanaḍhyanādisabdavācyaṃ darśana-mānākarāṇi smṛtiśaṃtānam atyarthapriyam* (for text ity-) *iha manmanā bhaveti vidhiyate / madbhakto 'tyartham matpriyo 'tyarthamatpriyatvena ca niratīyā-priyaṃ smṛtiśaṃtānam kuruṣvety arthaḥ* with, e.g. CBh. 1,1,1 p. 8 ff (Th. p. 13 ff).

<sup>59</sup> same expression CBh. 1,1,1 p. 8 (Th. p. 13).

whose compassionate eye is long and immaculate like a lotus-leaf, whose appearance is like a transparent blue haze, whose glow is as brilliant as that of a thousand rising suns, on Me the indestructible ocean of beauty, on Me whose four arms are as bulky as bellies, whose garment is of an extraordinarily radiant yellow hue, who am adorned with immaculate diadems, makara-formed ear-rings, strings of pearls, golden bracelets and arm-rings etc, on Me the shoreless ocean of mercy, goodness, radiance, leniency and love, Me the Refuge of all inconceivably differenced worlds, Me the Master of all Be my bhakta while focusing your mind on Me be you filled with overwhelming love for me, and when you have cognized Me as the immeasurably and incomparably adorable One, devote yourself to worshipping Me<sup>60</sup> Glorify me do not stop at living merely a life of complete subservience to Me, a life which you would consider eminently desirable because you cognize Me as the immeasurably and incomparably adorable One, but decide to humiliate yourself as deeply as possible before Me who am your innermost atman Seek your support in Me because without Me your âtman will be unsupported And, having by doing so prepared your mind<sup>61</sup> in immeasurable and overwhelming love to the attainment of Me, you shall attain Me to that end constantly performing the profane acts, required to sustain your body, as well as the periodical and occasional Vedic acts, while remembering that it is I who have brought about your sole delight in being subservient to Me and therefore performing all these acts to win My love, you should lovingly devote yourself to glorifications, sacrifices, worship etc for the glory of Me, and while realizing that I rule the world whose sole joy and essence it is to be subordinate to Me and meditating upon the multitudes of My perfectly adorable perfections, you should practise this worship as described above and thereby attain Me"

So, in bhaktiyoga the acts are not less important than they were in atmayoga they now play their part in man's progress to God, they are indirectly means of attaining God Man's active life becomes thus dedicated to the One from whom he derives his acting power This dedication may work out in different ways, depending as always on man's intention he may dedicate himself to gain *aśvarya*-, to attain *kaivalya*-, or to reach God himself The aspirant to *aśvarya* — prosper-

<sup>60</sup> = G *madyājī* which acc to R implies *aupacārika* acts (V waving lights before the idol etc), *sāṃsparśika* acts (V adorning the idol with garlands, incense etc) and *ābhyavahārika* acts (prostration etc)

<sup>61</sup> *ātmānam* G = R. *manah*

ity in the world in the widest sense — will naturally remain in *samsāra*, for he forsakes release. The aspirant to *kaivalya*<sup>62</sup> — total isolation in the immediate visualization of the *ātman* in its pure form distinct from *prakṛti* — may be compared to the *jñānayogin* of the first *saṅka*; with this difference that the *kaivalyārthin* more or less takes advantage of God to realize his aspiration.<sup>63</sup> The last one, the aspirant to God, or the *jñānin* — here again the aspect of knowledge in *bhakti* — is the complete *bhakta*, who does not seek God for the sake of worldly prosperity or solitary self-experience, but because God himself is his only aim, because he cannot be without God. His exclusive love for God is returned; lovingly God extends his Grace to his striving devotee;<sup>64</sup> and while proceeding further and further along the way of love, his loving representation of God becomes ever more intensified and ultimately his memory terminates in a total visualization of God in his divine majesty: he has attained God.

This progress of the aspirant to God by the way of *karma*-, *jñāna*-, and *bhakti*-yoga, which are not separate roads but successive stages of the same way culminating in the attainment of God, is for Rāmānuja the fundamental teaching of the *Gītā*. But we miss in this brief exposition of Rāmānuja's views that mystic doctrine which has grown so important in later *Viśiṣṭādvaita*, which has indeed divided the *Vaiṣṇavas* into two schools which exist today,<sup>65</sup> the doctrine of *prapatti*. The doctrine of *prapatti* as a second, and indeed a preferable, way to the attainment of God beside *bhakti* is completely absent in Rāmānuja's *Gītābhāṣya*. But in view of the later development of *prapatti*, in view too of the rôle that *prapatti* played in the religion of the *Ālvārs*, it seems

<sup>62</sup> by the time of *Ṣṛinivāsa* (see *YID.* 8, p. 76) when *bhakti* had become so all-important that everything else seemed negligible, *kaivalya* (originally a *Sāṃkhyan* term meaning "the *ātman*'s isolation from the bonds of *prakṛti*") was reinterpreted in the sense of "isolation from God" and acquired a pejorative connotation which, as Lacombe (*ASV.* p. 372, n. 1) justly remarks, is not apparent in *R.*

<sup>63</sup> The exact relation between the *jñānayogin* and the *kaivalyārthin* is not clear. It seems one of the instances of original *Sāṃkhyan* notions which are not wholly integrated in *R.*'s system.

<sup>64</sup> on the rôle of God's grace I may refer to Kumarappa's remarks, p. 294 ff.

<sup>65</sup> the Southern School (*Ten-galai*) which avows the so-called *mārjāraṇyāya* (entailing the doctrine that God alone is active and carries the self-surrendering devotee to his goal like a cat carries a kitten), and the Northern School (*Vadagalai*) which holds the *markaṣa* view (the devotee collaborates with God like a young monkey clings to the back of its mother): cf. A. Govindacarya, *Arthapāñcaka* translated, *JRAS* 1910, II, pp. 565 ff.

indicated to sketch here Rāmānuja's attitude with respect to prapatti in the Gītā

The general meaning in which Rāmānuja takes *pra-√pad* is "to take refuge in",<sup>66</sup> that may be in God in His human form by following his command (4,11), in God by considering Him to be the supreme end of all worship (7,19) — so it can also be applied to man's taking refuge in divinities as the principal objects of worship (7,20) — Besides it is called an activity which leads to bhakti (7,15),<sup>67</sup> it is paraphrased by "that 'approach' to Me which presupposes the true knowledge of the ātman that its sole essence is to be a śeṣa of God, while realizing that it is Vāsudeva who is man's supreme goal and who is all aspirations whatever that may make man reach that goal" (7,19), as such it is the only means for the aisvaryārthin, kaivalyārthin and jñānin to achieve their respective ends (14,27). by taking refuge in God one may attain the immediate presentation of the ātman (15,4-5) GBh ad 14,26-27 is interesting; R explains these stanzas in this sense that, only if God is served (paid homage *√scr-*) through bhaktiyoga, a man will be able to conquer the gunas and qualify himself to become *brahman-*, i.e. to attain the ātman in its pure form the immortal and imperishable ātman, for (st 27) God is the foundation alike of that immortal and imperishable<sup>68</sup> ātman (the end of the kaivalyārthin), of the eternal dharma, i.e. the eternal aisvarya (the end of the aisvaryārthin), and the perfect happiness, i.e. of the attainment of God (the end of the jñānin) R proceeds because in 7,14 it has been established that prapatti to God is the only way to conquer the gunas, and to attain aisvarya, kaivalya and God, it follows that the conquest of the gunas and the attainment of the ātman<sup>69</sup> (which presupposes the former) can only be possible through that exclusive prapatti to God — From this passage we must conclude that, here at least, R considered prapatti equivalent with bhakti

Finally I may point to 18 62 where *saranam gaccha* (*∞ pra-√pad*) is explained by *anurartasva* "follow, obey", this obeisance being the reason that the mayā is stopped (*etanmāyānivṛtīhetum*), with which

<sup>66</sup> synonymous with *(sam)a √sṛi* (4,11, 7,20), *saranam* (*upa*) *√gam* (15,4 5)

<sup>67</sup> *blaga adupāsanaṣṭādīnīm bhagavatprapattim, upāsana* is synonymous with bhakti

<sup>68</sup> R makes *amṛtasya, varasya* refer to the *brahma* of st 26 (*brahmabhūḍya*) which is there equated with *yathā.asthitam ātmānam*

<sup>69</sup> = R *brahman*, which in view of *brahma* in st 26 must be explained as ātman

I may compare 7,14 *mām eva ye prapadyante māyām etām taranti te*

Therefore, the only conclusion, we are entitled to draw from the above passages is this: *prapatti* is "taking refuge in God as the One who underlies everything, while cherishing the conviction that God is everything because he is the inner Ruler of all, so that, if one desires to achieve a certain end, be it prosperity, self-experience or the attainment of God himself, one has to follow Him, obey his commands and act according to his teaching." It is the nearest approach of the *aśvārthī* and the *kaivalyārthī* to *bhakti*, it is a first step in *bhakti*, for it is synonymous with the 'paying homage to God through *bhakti-yoga*' (14,27), it is presupposed by the attainment of *ātmāvalokana* (1b) and it is an activity which is presupposed by *bhakti* (*bhagavadupāśanāpādinīm bhagavatprapattim* (7,15)). Though it is intimated that *prapatti* provokes God's grace (7,18), there is no evidence that Rāmānuja believed that *prapatti* alone sufficed, that God would do the rest and that man's personal efforts in striving after prosperity, aspiring to *ātmāvalokana* and attaining God are forestalled by an act of grace. Nowhere the word has the later sense of "complete self-surrender of the devotee to God who, moved by the devotee's utter desolation, lifts him to beatitude by a mere act of grace."

Kumarappa, though holding essentially the same view,<sup>70</sup> reads more ambiguity in Rāmānuja's pronouncements on the subject of *prapatti*. He says<sup>71</sup> that Rāmānuja's teaching in the GBh differs from that in the ŚBh in this important respect that in the former text the function of God's grace in man's work for salvation is more stressed to the detriment of the value of man's personal efforts, and that "the religion to which Rāmānuja belonged seems to lead him to assert that the Deity requires nothing from the soul beyond self-surrender (= *prapatti*)". First he notes the contradiction between ŚBh 1,3,32 (Th. p 338) where it is said that a *śūdra* cannot be capable of knowledge of Brahman, this knowledge requiring the study of the Veda to which a *śūdra* is not entitled, and GBh 9,29-34 where it is said that everyone is equal before God and that even a *śūdra* by taking refuge to God (*vyapāśritya*) may attain the supreme end. But this does not necessarily imply that a *śūdra* may attain God as a *śūdra* by virtuously following God's commandments he may be reborn in a station in which he is better equipped to aspire to his end. Again in 15,4 Kumarappa reads

<sup>70</sup> "It must be said that the general trend of Rāmānuja's teaching is certainly in favour of the Northern School" (p 311)

<sup>71</sup> pp 305 ff.

that "all that is necessary for salvation is to flee to the Deity for Refuge and he will awake in the soul such tendencies as will lead it to release." But here, I think, Kumarappa attaches too much importance to a spurious reading: R. reads in G. 15,4 *prapadyed* (vulgate *prapadye*) in the first place; in the second place only he cites a variant reading which most probably is corrupted: *prapadyeyataḥ*<sup>72</sup> *pravṛttir* (= *prapadya iyataḥ pravṛttir*), while a variant reads *prapadya yataḥ*: it is this variant reading which Rāmānuja comments "With the improbable *iyataḥ* the sense would be 'solely by making prapatti to God the ancient pravṛtti (= activity in sublating ignorance etc.) is possible'; whereas the reading *prapadya, yataḥ* would mean '...after having taken refuge in God, a man will, departing from that, be active in sublating ignorance etc.'"; this latter sense is in keeping with R.'s explanation of the reading *prapadyed* etc. which he apparently prefers.<sup>73</sup> Furthermore, Kumarappa cites R.'s commentary on the famous Caramaśloka 18,66. Here again, however, he only quotes half of it, the latter half. R.'s first explanation is perfectly in keeping with his general views: "while performing all dharmas, viz. karma-, jñāna- and bhakti-yoga, as propitiations of God and therefore renouncing result, interest and agency, one should take refuge in Me; realizing that I alone am the agent<sup>74</sup> as well as the means by which you may attain me. If you do so, I will release you from all sins incompatible with your attainment of Me: do not worry." In his second interpretation he assumes that this stanza is meant to dispel Arjuna's fear that he may not be capable of bhaktiyoga, because of all his sins which would take such a long time to purify: "Dispense with all purificatory rites but take directly refuge in Me in order to succeed in bhaktiyoga; I will deliver you from all sins which prevent you to practise bhakti: do not worry." But to my mind even the latter explanation does not mean that taking refuge in God is quite enough: even if God by an act of grace has deigned to

<sup>72</sup> a rearrangement of the vulgate reading *prapadye yataḥ*.

<sup>73</sup> in total there are three readings: 1. R.'s first: *prapadyed / yataḥ* which R. explains in detail; 2. the ('sectarian') reading: *prapadyeyataḥ* of which no trace can be found in R.'s commentary, but which is given in Apte's text; 3. the 'variant' *prapadya / yataḥ*, which R. explains in the second place. The only reading which Kumarappa discusses is the second and most suspect one. Further corroboration for his view K. finds in 15,5 where he is lead astray by Gov.'s misleading translation "through my sole agency" where the text has *matprasāda* "by my collaborating grace"; besides he refers to the *Ṣaṇāgatigadya* ascribed to R., whose authorship is, however, not really established.

<sup>74</sup> this is not to be taken in the sense that God is the sole agent but that he grants his permission (*anumati*); cf. GBh. 18,14-15 and CBh. 2,3,41.

wash the incompatible sins away, Arjuna has still to practise bhakti. Here too we may consider the first interpretation as the one preferred by Rāmanuja.<sup>75</sup>

On the whole I may say that there is not sufficient evidence to conclude that Ramanuja's attitude with regard to man's personal efforts in securing his lofty end is different from that displayed in the Śrībhāṣya. Whenever God's grace is mentioned the personal efforts of the aspirant are stressed too. There is certainly no trace of that importance given to prapatti by later Viśiṣṭadvaitins. God's grace may crown the aspirant's efforts, but he first has to deserve it. Only when a man has devoted his life to exclusive bhakti towards God He will elect him to his beatitude.

## V

We have said before that in his Gītābhāṣya Ramanuja shows himself a priest rather than a critical and polemic thinker. Whatever this distinction is worth it may be justified in so far as it throws light on certain aspects of Ramanuja's personality which perhaps inevitably, often remain obscure in studies dealing with this typically Indian genius. Most works treat of 'Ramanuja the Philosopher', with his theory of knowledge, his philosophical system, his differences with Sāṅkara, etc., and Western scholars especially are apt to isolate him from his traditional background in order to shed light, almost exclusively, on those of his writings which appeal most to an abstract mind accustomed to evaluate philosophies rather than philosophers. Whereas Rāmanuja's commentary on Vedāntasūtra 1.1.1 has been translated time and again, hardly any attention has been paid to his other writings, the study of the genesis of his ideas even of his relation to his immediate predecessors, esp. Yaṁuna, has positively been neglected. But I would maintain that not only a just evaluation but also a right comprehension of Rāmanuja's contribution to Indian and Vedāntic thought cannot be possible unless we try to see him against his entire background and as part of a long tradition.

The Gītābhāṣya sheds some light on other aspects of his religious activities: we meet an Indian guru who explains a revered text to

<sup>75</sup> It is curious enough that R. proposes two explanations for stanzas which in later times have grown so important: there might be two reasons: 1. that R. though not subscribing entirely to the views of his contemporaries did not want to exclude these possible translations from his bhāṣya; 2. that both explanations are added by a later hand. On the possibility that R. considered the doctrine of prapatti too secret to divulge see Lacombe ASV p. 370 n. 5.



his disciples in the ancient and traditional manner, elucidating stanza after stanza, pausing at every word, enlarging upon every vital point and clarifying every difficulty. The great difference between his two commentaries on the Sūtras and the Gītā is that properly speaking only the latter is a commentary at all. Unlike the Sūtras whose concise and obscure style leaves all commentators ample scope for expounding the most divergent views, the Gītā is a rather long poem, coherent in itself, written in a simple style which seldom admits of more than one interpretation. Still, when we study the various commentaries on the Gītā we are struck not only by the divergence of one Indian commentary from the other, but also, and particularly so, by the divergence of all Indian commentaries together from the interpretations of modern scholarship. It may be worth while to occupy ourselves with this divergence.

The differences between traditional Indian and modern interpretation are determined by a basically different outlook. The modern scholar studies the texts from the historical point of view, the Indian *sub specie aeternitatis*. For the former the texts are determined by their place in history, their date, their relations to other texts of the same age, their connections with older and younger texts etc., whereas for the latter they are determined by their eternity, their eternity with respect to the past in which they have existed side by side with essentially consonant texts, forming a whole with all other sacred texts, and their eternity with respect to the present, the eternal authority which they have carried through all ages until now. His historical outlook leads the former to study the texts analytically so that by subtly weighing conformity and difference he may ultimately arrive at a well balanced interpretation of every historically unique text, whereas the latter arrives, or, rather, has already arrived beforehand, at his interpretation by the basic assumption of the characteristic conformity of every text to other similar texts. Seldom, and then only hesitantly, a modern scholar will utilize younger texts to interpret older ones, while for the Indian commentator all texts are the one expression of the everlasting present truth, so that every text can be interpreted in the terms of every other text.

The basic assumption is that of the *aikārthya*-of all sacred texts, a conception which can be traced back to the Karmamīmāṃsā where it was intimately connected with the principle of syntactical unity or *ekavākyādhikarana*.<sup>76</sup> The application of this principle, originally

<sup>76</sup> Mīmāṃsāsūtra 2,1,46 *arthakatvād ekam vākyam, sākāṅkṣyam ced vābhāge syāt* "so long as a single purpose is served by a number of words which, on

meaning that when a number of words serve the same purpose only if read in connection these words form a syntactical unity, was soon extended<sup>77</sup> it was said that those groups of words which convey a single idea should be regarded as one sentence, or, in other words, when there is singleness of meaning there must of necessity be consistency in the words, or sentences, or texts, which convey this meaning. In the Vedāntamīmāṃsā this principle became most important, whereas the Karmamīmāṃsā, dealing with a great variety of rites could solve all contradictions between certain injunctions by assuming that the different enjoined rites were optional, the Vedāntamīmāṃsā, dealing with texts which set forth the knowledge of Brahman could not solve similar contradictions by assuming that there were optional kinds of knowledge, but was by the very unity of knowledge itself forced to maintain the absolute consistency of all texts treating of knowledge.<sup>78</sup>

For Rāmānuja, unlike Sankara all scriptures are equally authoritative.<sup>79</sup> The *artha*- (at once "meaning", "idea", "purpose", and "end") of their injunctions being fundamentally the same,<sup>80</sup> it is the task of the commentator to find a method of interpretation by which all conflicting statements can be reconciled and given their proper place in a consistent explanatory system.<sup>81</sup>

We have seen that the task of *smṛti* is to elucidate *śruti*, this, of course, is only possible if *smṛti* agrees with *śruti*.<sup>82</sup> The *Gitābhāṣya* provides several interesting instances of the manner in which this elucidation and this agreement was conceived and applied. GBh 3,4 R states his view that *jñānayoga* is ancillary to *bhaktiyoga* which alone leads to knowledge of God, he corroborates this view by referring to Prajāpati's speech, ChUp 8,7-12, where, according to R, the knowledge of the individual *atman* is taught this knowledge corresponds with that of *jñānayoga*. The ChUp passage 8,7-12 is connected with ChUp 8,1-3, which, again according to R, deals with the knowledge of God and

being separated are found to be wanting and incapable of effecting the said purpose they form one 'Syntactical Unit' — one complete Yajush Mantra", Jhā p 189

<sup>77</sup> cf Jhā p 190 f

<sup>78</sup> cf Thibaut *Vedānta Sūtras* (SBE. XXXIV) p xi

<sup>79</sup> Srinivasachari *Finite Self* p 3 f

<sup>80</sup> cf GBh 2,41 *ekasmai mokṣaphalāya hi mumukṣoḥ sarvaṇi karmāni vidhīyante / atah sūtrārthasvaikatvāt sarvakarma-ṛgāyā buddhir ekanā / etc.*

<sup>81</sup> cf GBh. 1,1,1 (Th p. 138 ff), Ved p 16 ff

<sup>82</sup> cf GBh. 1,1,1 p. 72 (Th. p. 91), quoted supra n. 16, and GBh 2,1,1, (Th. 411) *upadṛṣṭhanam ca śrutiśratipannārthatvādīkaranam tac ca vīruddhārthatayā smṛtyā na lakṣyate kartum*

sets forth in 8,3,4 what is the fruit of knowledge of God, viz the ātman's entering into the supreme light So there is perfect agreement between the Gīta progress jñānayoga → knowledge of God in bhakti-yoga → union with God, and ChUp 8,7-12 → 8,1-3 → 8,3,4 So R at once elucidates these śruti passages by interpreting them according to his views on the Gīta and corroborates these views by adducing evidence from the śruti Another instance is GBh 8,3 where *karman* which has the sense of "creative act" is explained by "procreative act" with reference to the pañcāgnividyā of ChUp 5,4-10, where in 5,8 the sacrifice (= *karman*-, hence the connection) is described in the terms of cohabitation The reason of this connection becomes clear in GBh 8,23 ff where the two roads of light and darkness are spoken of this passage is connected with ChUp 5,10 and the conspicuous resemblance of the Gīta with this śruti justify the connection But the śruti passage is interpreted in a curious way which we can only understand when we compare Gītā 8,8 ff there three groups of aspirants are discussed, the aśvārthins, the kaivalyārthins and the jñānins, of whom only the first will return to saṁsāra The parallelism of the two roads in Gīta and ChUp 5,10 leads R to identify these three groups of aspirants with the persons mentioned in 5,10 *tad ya ittham viduḥ* correspond to the kaivalyārthins "who know this", viz the preceding paragraphs on *karman*, *ye ceme 'ranye sradhā tapa ity upāsate* correspond to the jñānins or perfect bhaktas (*upāsana*- being synonymous with bhakti, hence the identification) and *ya ime grāma istapūrte dattam ity upāsate* (5,10,3) to the aśvārthins, of whom it is said that they will return to saṁsāra, whereas the others will not return<sup>83</sup> So the śruti agrees perfectly with the Gītā But how can R identify the kaivalyārthins with *tad ya ittham viduḥ*? Remember the kaivalyārthin is the one who strives after, and acquires eventually, true knowledge of the ātman as distinct from prakṛti Now, R contends, the śrutis *pañcamyām dhutāv āpah puruṣa-vacaso bhavanti*<sup>84</sup> (ChUp 5,9,1) and 5,10,7 declare that *karman* causes a man to be born in a body which consists of elements (water etc) and

<sup>83</sup> which R says appears from ChUp 5,10,2 *sa enān* (sc the two categories spoken of in 5,10,1) *brahma gamayati* it is interesting to note that R couples this passage with ChUp 4,15,6 which corresponds to a great extent, however, in GBh 3,0 (discussed above) R maintained that this passage of the *daharavidyā* or attainment of God corresponds with the ultimate attainment of God through bhakti as set forth in the G, but only the perfect bhakta or jñānin attains God not the kaivalyārthin so that there seems to be a contradiction.

<sup>84</sup> which, to accord with R., should be interpreted "by *karman* the elements (water etc) are coupled with the puruṣa (ātman)".

that the *atman* is but enveloped by these elements so here the *śruti* expounds the difference between *atman* and body, it is this knowledge of the *kaivalyārtham* which is resumed in *tad* in *tad ya uttham viduh*<sup>82</sup> We may safely say that here the *Gita* has done more to corroborate the *śruti* than contrariwise. An instance of a different kind where a *Gītā* passage is projected against the background of the *śruti* is GBh 3,30-31, here R interprets *mayi sarvāṇi karmāṇi samīkṣyā* in the sense that God is the *atman* of all beings and, as their *antaryāmin*, actuates them all and so is to be regarded as the ultimate agent of their acts. This sense, he proceeds, is the essential doctrine of the *upaniṣads*, so the importance of 3.31 f. stands suddenly out in relief.

The principle of *aikāntīya*-bears not only on different texts, but also on each text itself. We have seen how this principle was applied to the ChUp where seemingly unconnected fragments were made to form a consistent whole. The *Gītābhāṣya* in its entirety is another example we have seen that the whole *Gītā* is so interpreted that it forms a consistent whole. The different parts which make up this whole are, too, explained as consistently as possible. A curious case is to be found in 3.36 ff. where the influence of *kāma*- is discussed, the author of the *Gītā* concludes his discussion in 41 by showing the way in which *kāma*- may be conquered, which is modified in 43 after a parenthetical Sāṅkhyan survey of the levels of psychical functions: senses, *manas*, *buddhi*, beyond which is *saḥ* by which obviously the *atman* is meant, as is proved by 43 *buddheḥ param ātmānam*. R disregards the parenthesis of 42, and takes the senses in 42 to mean what they meant in 41: obstacles to be conquered, so that *manas* and *buddhi* are consistently taken to mean further obstacles, and *saḥ* the last one, which therefore is made to stand for *kāma*-, but this forces him in 43 to equate *ātmānam* with *manas* and *ātmanā* with *buddhyā*.

The tendency to interpret the text as consistently as possible easily entails over-interpretation, by which I mean the over-emphasizing of an often far-fetched sense found in certain passages and stanzas, which thereby are given over-due significance and made to determine the general trend of interpretation. For instance, the over-interpretation of G 2,12 which is treated of as a proof of the reality of the plurality and individuality of the *ātmans* and of the reality of the difference between God and *ātman*, or 2,17-18 where in a most ingenious way

<sup>82</sup> but *tad* refers also to the *karman* described in 5.4-9, esp. 9, which, we may remember, was identified with the *karman* of G 8.3 which was particularly to be known (and forsaken) by the *kaivalyārtham*.

nothing less than complete syllogisms are construed which prove the mortality of the body and immortality of the atman. A clear example provides 4,18-19 in st 16 *akarmān-* was given the sense of "knowledge" (*akarmān-* > *jñānayoga-* > *jñāna-*) and *karman-* that of 'karmayoga'. In st 19 R reads a proof for his interpretation that karmayoga implies knowledge: this is deduced from *tam āhuḥ paṇḍitam budhāḥ* "sages who know the truth call a man who practises karmayoga a knowing man". Which proves that karmayoga implies knowledge. In the same trend 20 cd *karmāny abhīpīavṛtto pi naiva kṛmicit karoti sah* is interpreted and *na karoti* given the sense of "he practises *akarmān-* or knowledge". The conception that karmayoga itself implies knowledge of the atman plays a leading part in the interpretation of the first satka.<sup>86</sup> Another example is that of the three groups of aspirants, *aśvārthins*, *kaivalyārthins* and *jñānins* which are first met with in 7, 16 where *ārta-* and *arthārthins-* are both explained as *aśvārthins* differing only in degree (*gunābheda-matram*) *jyāsu* as the *kaivalyārthins* who wishes to acquire knowledge of the atman as distinct from *prakṛti*, and *jñānins-* as the complete *bhakta*. These three groups play an important rôle: they return in 7,28-29 and throughout 8, where esp. the passage stt 8-15 is made to refer to them and interpreted in a way contrary to the obvious sense of these stanzas.

Instances of similar forced explanations which overstress a not impossible, and often enough improbable sense of a passage or stanza in order to arrive at a consistent connotation or to make them agree with the general trend of interpretation are very numerous. In many cases they entail similar explanations of single words which are taken in an unusual sense so that they can be fitted into the sense of the whole passage. We have seen that by disregarding the parenthesis of 3,42 and by making *sah* refer to *kāma-* R was forced to explain *ātmanam* in 43 by *manah*, and that in 4,16 ff *akarmān-* was taken in the sense of "knowledge" to account for certain ambiguities in the Gita text.

Generally speaking the same tendencies of which we have already spoken influence the sense in which a word is taken, viz. the tendency to take no account of the historical meaning of a certain word, the sense most common to it in a certain period and a certain text, and the tendency to make its sense entirely dependent on the given context, the general sense of which has been established beforehand. It happens that in the same context the same word is explained in a different way.

<sup>86</sup> see Ch IV

E.g., in GBh 4,18-24 the element of knowledge implied in karmayoga is under discussion. To retain a consistent sense st 24 is interpreted in the same terms. The commentary is preceded by a short introduction in the preceding stanzas it has been said that karmayoga implies knowledge of the atman, now it is said that it implies knowledge as it implies the realization that all action (sc ritual) is ensouled by the Supreme Person who is the Supreme Brahman thus we have to interpret *brahman-* in 24 as *parabrahman* or God as the antaryamin, but 24 cd *brahmaiva tena gantaryam brahmakarmasamādhinā* is explained "a person who has formed the opinion that all acts consist of br in so far as they are ensouled by br is able to reach (not the Supreme Brahman or God the prerogative of the bhakta, but ) the ātman",<sup>87</sup> so that in e *brahman* = the atman, and in d *brahman-* = the Supreme Brahman. The instances of various explanations of *brahman-* are interesting here more than in other cases, its full repertory of meanings is used with some philosophical justification.

The term *brahman*<sup>88</sup> is used to connote God, atman and prakṛti. In its primary sense<sup>89</sup> *brahman* denotes God, the Supreme Brahman, the Absolute One, the inner Ruler of the world the material cause of the world and as such its effect,<sup>90</sup> it is the underlying divine Reality (4 24-25), the sole End to be reached (8 24). Secondly it connotes the atman but then the atman in its pure form released from its bondage to prakṛti as an entity of its own kind (atmavastu), essentially the same in all beings which has unlimited knowledge as its form and the immediate contemplation of which is a source of perfect, everlasting happiness (2 72, 5 6, 19 20 21, 24-26, 6, 27-28, 7, 29, 8, 1, 3, 13, 30, 14 26 27 18 50, 53 54). At the root of this connotation is the meaning of *brahman-* in Sāṃkhyan philosophy,<sup>91</sup> but its Sāṃkhyan meaning is given a new and religious significance by the fact that the ātman is a prakara of God as the Supreme Brahman, *brahman-* does not assume a completely different sense by connoting the atman but the connotation *brahman-* gives the atman itself a new significance, that of being utterly dependent on and internally ruled by the Supreme

<sup>87</sup> I have abbreviated this passage

<sup>88</sup> on R s etymology of *brahman* GBh 1 12 (Th p 158) *anātadhikāṇṣayabrhad īrmhanam ca brahma | bhāter dhātos tadāthātāt* br is immeasurably and incomparably large and all supporting for these are the meanings of  $\sqrt{brh}$ , see Gonda, *Brahman* p 20 and passim

<sup>89</sup> cf e.g. GBh 2,34 and passim compare also Gonda o.c., p 12

<sup>90</sup> GBh 13,2.

<sup>91</sup> Gonda o.c. p 12 where further references

Brahman which is God<sup>92</sup> Another secondary<sup>93</sup> meaning of *brahman-* is *prakṛti* (3,15; 5,10; 6,44; 14,3-4), at the root of which is the Sāmkhya sense "immense complexity of elements which is always changing, one, uncaused, independent, eternal and all-pervading",<sup>94</sup> but this sense is again modified and elevated by the fact that the *prakṛti* is a *prakāra* of the Supreme Brahman who pervades, directs and animates it In this sense *brahman-* connotes the subtle elements<sup>95</sup> Still, even in the intimate unity of Brahman with spiritual and non-spiritual substances as the *upādāna-* of material cause of the world, all three entities remain categorically different and distinct from one another<sup>96</sup>

Yet we wonder whether all these implications of the usage of *brahman-* were always considered by R, in some cases definitely not E.g., *brahman-* in G 13,12 (which R reads *anādi matparam brahma*, to avoid *param brahma*) means nothing but "ātman". R declares *ātmany api brahmasabdah prayajyate* and refers to 14,26-27 and 18,54 where the word has the same sense, this same *brahman-* is identified with *ksetrajñatattva-* "the category of *ksetrajña-*" with reference to its etymology *brhattvagunayogi ksetrajñatattvam* "ks can be called br because it possesses the property of *brhattva-* 'exceeding greatness'"<sup>97</sup>

It can easily be understood that when the insight in the semantic development of a word is wanting, the etymology of that word becomes very important: the etymology may provide the commentator with an

<sup>92</sup> cf also Lacombe, ASV p 287 ff I cannot however agree with his opinion that *ekarasa-* in *seṣataikarasa-* GBh 7,19, said of ātman and prakṛti) would mean that "elle (the ātman) est de même essence en tant qu'elle forme une partie intégrante de son (brahman's) corps", the expression is synonymous with *-śeṣataikarati-* (Intr) and *-seṣataikasvabhāva-* (18 54) the ātman's sole delight, or sole essence, is to be a *seṣa* of God a subordinate principle pervaded by God as its inner Ruler, an *aprthaksiddhāḥiṣeṣana-* of God *Rasa-* has both connotations "joy" and "essence" So, *paramapurūṣaseṣataikarasatā* (GBh 7,19) cannot mean "the being 'de même essence que la Personne Suprême parce qu'elle (atman) est un élément subordonnée de son être'", but rather "the having as its sole joy-and-essence the being a *seṣa* of the Supreme Person"

<sup>93</sup> cf CBh 2,3,4 *brahmasabdah 'tasmād etad brahma nāmarūpam annam ca jāyate'* (MunUp 1,1,9) ity atra pradhāne gānatayā prayuktah

<sup>94</sup> Gonda, op.c., p 12 where further references, cf CBh 1,4,14 (Th p 375) where a Sāmkhya adversary is introduced who interprets *brahman-* as *pradhāna-*

<sup>95</sup> *bhūtādisūkṣma-* GBh 13,2

<sup>96</sup> *atah sthūlasūkṣmacūḍacitprakāram brahmanya kārjyam kāramam ceti brahmopādānam jagat*, GBh 13,2, cf CBh 1,4,23 (Th p 398 ff)

<sup>97</sup> cf CBh 1,1,2 where the same etymology of *brahman-* (quoted supra n 88) is given, but there it refers to the Supreme Brahman The complete passage in GBh runs *brhattvagunayogi śarīrād arthāntarabhūtam svataḥ sarīrādibhiḥ paricchedarहितam ksetrajñatattvam ity arthah* "the *ksetrajña* is *bhāt-* because it cannot be encompassed by bodies etc., for it is different from the body"

appropriate meaning which is not to be found elsewhere but still has the dignity of its ancient source. Instances of etymological interpretations are numerous. In 2,18 the (pseudo<sup>2</sup>-) etymology of *deha* <√*dih*- in the sense of "combination, augmentation" (*upacaya*-) is used to prove that a body is a combination of elements and therefore perishable, *munī*- is explained throughout by *ātmanānānāsila*- because of the pseudo etymology <√*man*-,<sup>98</sup> in 2,44 *samādhi*- is explained by *manas* because it is in the *manas* that the knowledge of the *ātman* is contemplated (*samā*-√*dhi*-), in 11,10 *deva*- is rendered by *dyotamāna*- and in 11,15 *divya*- by *dīpta*-, no doubt because they derive from √*dyu*-*div*-, in 11,24 *Viṣṇu*- is rendered by *vyāpīn*- (√*viś*- or *vis*-), *loka*- in 15, 17 and 18, and 16,6 is explained by "that which is seen" from √*lok*-, etc.

Under the same head I would bring the explanations which are derived from the literal and radical meaning of a word. *prajāpati*- in 3,10 is not Prajapati but literally "the lord of the creatures, God", *brāhmaṇa*- in 2,46 = *brahmasambandhin*- (*brahman*- in the sense of "Veda") = *vaidika*- (cf. *brāhmaṇa*- in 17,13 qualified for *brahman*- or the Veda the first three varṇas). Only when we keep in mind the radical meaning of √*yuj*- "to join, combine, connect etc." we understand the many different meanings of *yoga*-, even when that word occurs in expressions like *yogakṣema*- (2,45. *yoga*- = *aprāptasya prāptih*, *kṣema*- = *prāptasya pariraksanam*, whereas 9,22 *yoga*- = *matprāptilakṣana*-, *kṣema*- = *apunarāvṛttirūpa*-) and *yogeśvara*- (11,4 "possessor of *yoga*- = *jñānādīkalyāṇagunayoga*-", vid 18,75, but 18,78 'lord of the *yogas* = *kṛtsnasyocāvararūpenāvasthūtacetanasyācetanasya ca svabhāvayogāḥ*).

Usually the many equations go unexplained, very frequently *ātman*- is equated with *manas*-, but only once, not before 6,47, we learn on what grounds there *antarātman*- is equated with *manas*-, for *bāhyābhīntarasakalāvṛttivśeśasrayabhūtam manah* from which we gather that *ātman*- = *manas*- inasmuch as the *manas* is, like the *ātman*, an *āśraya*-. Often these equations will find their ground in specialized usages which we do not know but which for a Sanskrit-speaking Indian needed no explanation. Sometimes an equation which at first seems fantastic is on further consideration found acceptable, e.g. in 4,6 *māyā* is equated with *jñāna*- on the strength of a Nighantu, and *jñāna*- again equated with *samkalpa*-, but when we consider the creative aspect of *jñāna*- and the etymologies of *māyā* (√*mā*- "to fashion") and *samkalpa*

<sup>98</sup> cf. CBh 3,4,46 (Th. p. 710), quoted in n. 103





by a śruti; e.g. *akṣara-* in 11,18 *tvam akṣaram paramam veditavyam* denotes God: R. connects this with MuṇḍUp. 1,1,4 *dve vidye veditavye*, the second of which is the Supreme One or *akṣara-* (1,1,5); but in 11,37 *akṣara-* is rendered by *jīvātman* which is *akṣara-* because it does not perish (*na kṣarati*), as is proved by KāthUp. 2,18 (R. reads G. 11,37 d: *tvam akṣaram (= jīvātman) sadasat (= prakṛti) tat-param yat* (the Supreme Person beyond cit and acit)).

Finally, R. often interprets a pregnant meaning in a seemingly indifferent word; e.g. in 11,9 *Harīḥ / darśayāmāsa Pārthāya paramam rūpam aiśvaram*, a subtle meaning is detected in the use of the metro-nymic *Pārtha*: Arjuna is the son of Pṛthā, the sister of Kṛṣṇa's father, and this intimate relationship may be one of the reasons that God's grace is shown to Arjuna.



These remarks and notes, desultory though they are, may give us some idea of the way in which Rāmānuja arrived at his interpretations which so frequently differ from those given by modern scholarship. If anything, they show how ample a scope an Indian commentator was allowed for explaining a celebrated text in accordance with the views of the religious milieu he represented. The two principles which determine the interpretation, viz. the basic assumptions of the consistency and of the eternity of the sacred texts, run counter to the fundamental principles of modern scholarship and we have to reject them. But it should be remembered that both assumptions, which are closely related, have saved the texts from oblivion. A text was never located in a historic past and thereby saved from being fossilized in a too exclusive connection with that past. Its very eternity brought it directly into the present and made it a living force which could keep inspiring the Indian thinkers. Being fundamentally consistent with all other sacred texts, each text was more than itself alone; the lofty thoughts of all texts together could inter-act, complete one another, shed light on one another. We should remember that these texts were never for an Indian what they are for us: historically unique books, belonging to a remote and dead past, gravely to be consulted by scholars with a penchant for history and tradition, but that they were living memories: they were known by heart and consequently by fragments. Every age and every milieu spontaneously made its own selection: those revelations which at a given place and time were most vivid to the mind determined the views on and the interpretations of the complete texts. So, however

eternal and eternally true they were, they were liable to change in aspect: ever new facets were discovered and though the new light shed on those facets inevitably obscured others, it renewed the illuminating power of a text which was made a many-sided crystal ready to reflect every light with a light of its own. So many fragments could be connected in so many ways, and spontaneously an illuminating combination jumped to the eye and a new interpretation was born. This interpretation was elaborated, more pieces were fitted in the new pattern, and finally it was given the finishing touch by a commentator who set himself to the task of completing the work of generations. Often he would have to force the pieces together, but it was only the pattern that mattered and this pattern was indicated by a few single fragments.

So it can happen that while we differ in the interpretation of almost every stanza of the Gītā we can agree with the general trend of Rāmānuja's interpretations. For Rāmānuja's bhāṣya does fully justice to the intentions of the author of the Gītā: to reconcile the barren absolute of monistic thought with the living God of devotion and to show a new and supreme way to attain release, the way of exclusive devotion to a merciful personal God, endowed with all perfections, who can be fully known only through love. It is by this agreement that we should evaluate Rāmānuja's commentary. We cannot judge it by our own scholarly principles, for we see that just by diverging from these principles Rāmānuja was able to fulfil what he conceived to be his only task: to restore the Bhagavadgītā not only in the hearts but also in the minds of the Indian thinkers and thereby to restore the unity of religion and philosophy. In this respect we may say that he has been truer to the spirit of the Gītā than modern scholarship could ever be. He has completed the task which the poet of the Gītā had begun, the reconciliation of thought and religion.

*Note on my condensed rendering of the Gītābhāṣya.*

The form in which I present my English rendering of Rāmānuja's Gītābhāṣya needs some explanation and justification. Right from the start it has been my object to render this important commentary as accessible as possible to the sanskritist as well as the student of comparative religion and philosophy. But an Indian commentary is something of its own kind; the commentators have their own style, technique and rules which make a literal translation into a Western language difficult if not impossible. The method of explaining the commented text *verbum verbo et nomen nomine*, the elementary punctuation of the devanāgarī script and the want of an annotation system, due to the custom of Indian scribes to cover their palm-leaves length-wise and at a stretch, all make an Indian commentary somewhat forbidding to Western readers. Simple explanations, paraphrases, references, etymologies, digressions and disquisitions are put side by side and often in parenthesis in one long explanatory sentence. The sanskritist may soon find his way through this labyrinth, but it is out of place in a translation where full profit could be drawn from the resources of modern punctuation and typography.

All this applies to Rāmānuja's Gītābhāṣya. When I had finished a complete translation of this text into Dutch, I found it would be neither necessary nor desirable to have it printed in extenso. A translation of a Sanskrit text like this can never be meant to replace the original text, but only to make it accessible and to clarify it. A student who wishes to study the text itself could never use a translation instead of the original, however helpful it might be to his study of that original. Both for him and for one who is interested in the bhāṣya with respect to the Gītā, or Viśiṣṭādvaita, or Rāmānuja himself, a condensed rendering, in which all important points and all interesting details are given their due and all difficulties are discussed, will suffice. Moreover, in such a condensed rendering the superficial obscurities which all Indian commentaries present could more easily be disposed of, the full meaning of the text consequently more clearly stated and the continuity of the commentary better preserved than would be possible in a verbatim translation. On the other hand the bhāṣya should remain what it is, = running commentary to be consulted at the reading of the commented text.

I found that the bulk of the complete translation, which in print would have comprised some 300 pages without notes, could easily

and justifiably be reduced to something less than half that size This could be achieved 1 by giving in notes a all minor details which have no direct bearing on the general interpretation of a certain verse, b all references to *sruti* and *smṛti* and cross-references to *Gītā* verses, 2 by omitting a all those explanations whose interest is didactic rather than scholarly, b all those remarks which have already been frequently made or whose purport is sufficiently clear from foregoing discussions, 3 by condensing in a concise style the direct material interpretations, using Ramanuja's own words

A critic who would take the pains of comparing my condensed rendering with the Sanskrit original will, I trust, find it to be adequate, though he may note some discrepancies Ramanuja retains throughout the direct speech of the *Gita* in his verbatim translations but switches over to indirect speech in his general remarks, for the sake of consistency I have used indirect speech throughout, except in Lecture XI where Arjuna is personally granted a vision of God Nowhere does R discriminate between Kṛṣṇa and the supreme personal Deity, on the contrary he seldom misses an opportunity to emphasize that Kṛṣṇa is God, so I have throughout called the Teacher of the *Gita* by the names of God As God addresses whole mankind in the person of Arjuna, I have given His direct exhortations a general bearing as indeed R explicitly and implicitly does In a few isolated cases I have transported the interpretation of a verse to another paragraph so that R's meaning could more systematically be stated

For the sake of clarity I have divided the subject matter into paragraphs where R explicitly and implicitly treats a group of verses as forming a unit The short introductions which R prefaces to the explanation of a single verse or a group of verses either elucidating the transition from one verse to another or marking a new paragraph are given in the text Frequently R explains a verse or group of verses as being an answer to an implied question, this is clearly indicated by the words *Question* and *Answer* in the text The same is done where Arjuna is questioning the Lord, a glance at the *Gita* will show which of the two is meant

The method I have followed in my rendering has, as far as I know, not been tried before Perhaps some may think my treatment of the *Gitābhāṣya* Procrustean still whatever its imperfections may be, it certainly will show no want of respect for Ramanuja whose important interpretations I have earnestly tried to present in as lucid and accessible a form as possible

**A CONDENSED RENDERING OF RĀMĀNUJA'S  
GĪTĀBHĀSYA**

### Dedicatory verse.

I greet the sage Yāmuna:<sup>1</sup> by meditating on his feet I have been purified of all impurities and become what I am.<sup>2</sup>

### Introduction.

Now, the Consort of Śrī, whose proper form,<sup>3</sup> antagonistic to all that is evil and solely comprising all that is good, is nothing but knowledge and bliss;

the ocean of innumerable beautiful qualities, such as boundless and supreme knowledge, power, force, sovereignty, fortitude, mastery, etc., qualities proper to his nature;<sup>4</sup>

the treasury of numberless properties, such as brilliance, beauty, comeliness, youthfulness etc., which are in accord with his pleasure and which are unimaginable, divine and miraculous, impeccable and incomparable;<sup>5</sup>

whose divine shape is adorned with manifold and manifold endless, wonderful, eternal, irreproachable, immeasurable divine ornaments and equipped with innumerable weapons which, being worthy of their bearer, are of inconceivable power, eternal, impeccable and incomparable;<sup>6</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Yāmuna or Ālavandār, predecessor of R. at the temple of Çrīraṅga; on his influence on R. see Ch. II.

<sup>2</sup> *vastutām upāyāto*; on the expression cf. GBh. 4,14 and ÇBh. 2,1,34.

<sup>3</sup> *svarūpa*; on this term see Lacombe, ASV. p. 48 f.

<sup>4</sup> 1. *jñāna*- "immediate intuitive knowledge of everything" (*sarvasākṣātkāra-rūpa*); 2. *śakti*- "creative power" (*aghaṣitaḥaṣaṇāśāmarthyam*); 3. *bala*- "power" (*niyamanasāmarthyam*); 5. *vīrya*- or *dhairya*- "the being not subject to vikāras or transformations" (*avikāritvam*); 6. *tejas*- "power to overcome others" (*parābhibhāvasāmarthyam*), cf. YID. 7, p. 60; these are the *śāḍgunya*- or the six *kalyāṇaguṇas*, perfect qualities proper to God's nature.

<sup>5</sup> These, acc. to YID. 6, p. 55, are the qualities proper to God's beatific personality (*divyamāṅgalavīrahaguṇāḥ*); Çrīnivāsa (Ic.) adds *tarya* (sc. *īśvarasya*) *vijāpakatvam gītādiṣu prasiddham* "texts like the Gītā prove that these qualities are invariably concomitant with God".

<sup>6</sup> cf. YID. 6, p. 54 *bhagavato 'prākṛtadivyamāṅgalavīrahaḥ tv astraśṭāṇḍya-yuktasarpāśrayaḥ*; the chapter referred to is VP. 22; the ornaments and weapons are: the Kaustubha jewel; the Çrīvatsa curl; the Club; the Conch; the Bow; the Sword; the Discus; the Arrows; and the Garland

whose perfections, glory and lordship, being essentially in accordance with his will, are eternal and unrivalled;

who holds Śrī<sup>7</sup> dear because of her boundless, perfect and numberless beautiful virtues such as faithfulness and the like;

whose feet are incessantly praised by numberless sūris<sup>8</sup> with endless virtues of perfect, unsurpassed knowledge, actions etc., whose proper forms, maintenance and various activities<sup>9</sup> are dependent on his volition, and whose sole delight is to be completely subservient<sup>10</sup> to Him;<sup>11</sup>

who, whereas his proper nature and beings are incomprehensible by speech and thought, reigns a boundless and wondrous dominion which abounds in numberless objects, means and places of experiences of all kinds and forms, and which suits his pleasure;<sup>12</sup>

who resides in the Supreme Heaven<sup>13</sup> which is of immeasurable circumference, eternal, indestructible, irreproachable and imperishable;

whose sport<sup>14</sup> is to originate, develop and submerge the entire universe crowded with experiencing and experienced entities of all sorts and forms;

who is the Supreme Brahman;<sup>15</sup>

<sup>7</sup> Viṣṇu's or Nārāyaṇa's consort, acc. to pāñcarātric cosmology, the active and creative aspect of the Supreme Being.

<sup>8</sup> sūri- or nityasūri- 'angelic' being eternally released from saṃsāra and possessed of a beautified body (YID. 4, p. 46 *nityasūrinām ca svābhāvikaṃ Garuḍabhujaḍḍirāṇam*; *bhuja-* is the serpent Ṣeṣa, Nārāyaṇa's throne).

<sup>9</sup> *svasaṃkalpānuvidhāyisvarāpasthitiḥpravṛttibheda-*; Lacombe (ASV. p. 278) interprets *svarāpasthiti* + *pravṛttibheda-* as a dvandva of two tatpuruṣas ("constants en leur nature essentielle et diligents en la diversité des actions extérieures") which should be rejected in view of 10.42 *idaṃ ... jagat ... svarāpasadbhāve sthitaṃ pravṛttibhede ca ... molsaṃkalpam nātivartate*; it is a three-membered dvandva (*svarāpa-sthiti-pravṛttibheda-*) constituting the last member of a bahuvrīhi.

<sup>10</sup> *aśeṣaśeṣaikaaratirāpa-*; *śeṣa-* "subsidiary: subordinate part," *śeṣatva-* "subordinate-ness and subservience of prakṛti- and puruṣa- to God, utter dependence"; cf. Srinivasachari, Finite Self, p. 39 ff.

<sup>11</sup> this line describes God's relation to the finite ātmans.

<sup>12</sup> this line describes God's relation to the non-spiritual world which provides the jīvātman with the objects, means and places of experience. Acc. to YID. 6, p. 53 the objects are: God's body etc. (sc. in devout worship of the *arcā* or image); the means: sandal incense, flowers, robes, ornaments, weapons etc. (to adorn the idol); and the places: temple-gates (*gopura-*), enclosures, pavillions, palaces (*śrīmāna-*), gardens, lotus-ponds etc.

<sup>13</sup> *paramayōman-*, one of the names of the Supreme Heaven or *Vaikunṭha-* which is described in detail in YID. 6, p. 55.

<sup>14</sup> *līlā*, a term usually rendered by "sport", denotes a, more or less creative, act which is, unlike *karma-*, not performed to realize a desire or to achieve an end and is therefore not followed by retributing or recompensating results; cf. ÇBh. 2.1.33; Lacombe, Note 2, and ASV. p. 240 ff., esp. p. 246 f.

<sup>15</sup> this against Ç. who reserves the term for the unqualified Absolute.



the Supreme Person,<sup>16</sup>

Nārāyaṇa,<sup>17</sup>

He has created the entire universe, from Brahmā to minerals, and, although He is inaccessible to the meditation, worship etc. of gods — Brahmā etc — and men when He exists in his proper form, has by his own will (for He is a shoreless ocean of compassion, goodness, love and generosity) assumed a shape of the same structure<sup>18</sup> as theirs without giving up<sup>19</sup> his proper nature,<sup>20</sup> and in that shape He has descended<sup>21</sup> repeatedly to various worlds in order that He might be worshipped by the beings who live in these worlds and so bring them nearer to the fruits of dharma, artha, kāma<sup>22</sup> and release<sup>23</sup> in accordance with their desires; thus He has descended, seemingly to rule the earth but actually to alleviate the burdens of saṃsāra even of the like of us, and so become visible to all mankind, and He has accomplished feats which drove away the sufferings of all people of all ranks — so He has slain Pūtana, Śakata, Yamala, Arjuna, Arista, Pralamba, Dhenukāsura, Kāliya, Keśin, Kuvalayāpīda, Cānūra, Mustika, Kausala, Kamsa, etc.;<sup>24</sup> then, slaking the thirst of all with the elixirs of his glances and words animated by boundless mercy, kindness and tenderness, He has made Akūrā, Mālākāra and others<sup>25</sup> the most ardent Bhāgavatas by revealing the multitudes of his unsurpassed virtues of beauty, goodness etc., until, at last, while pretending to exhort Arjuna to fight, He has revealed the bhaktiyoga, promoted by jñāna- and karmayoga, which in the Vedānta is declared to be the means of attaining man's supreme end, release, and of which He himself is the object

<sup>16</sup> on the personality of God see Lacombe ASV p 277 ff

<sup>17</sup> R's favourite name for God, denotes the Supreme Being in Pañcarātra (cf CBh 22,43 (Th p 559 ff)) see Kumārappa pp 90 f and 99 ff

<sup>18</sup> *saṃsthāna-* or "generic structure of beings belonging to the same *jāti*", see Sinha, p 49 f

<sup>19</sup> cf CBh 1,32 (Th p 297)

<sup>20</sup> that described above

<sup>21</sup> *avatīrya*.

<sup>22</sup> the *trivarga* or *puṣārthas*, "the ends of human life"

<sup>23</sup> *apavarga-* or *paramapuṣārtha-* 'man's supreme end'

<sup>24</sup> see VP 5

<sup>25</sup> see VP 5, 17 ff and 5,19

## PART ONE

### I THE KNOWLEDGE OF THE ATMAN

#### A INTRODUCTORY

##### 1 *Introduction of the Bhagavadgītā*

1, 1 Dhrtarastra knows that Arjuna, on whose side Kṛṣṇa, the Supreme  
Person, stands, has the upper hand but being blind in all respects <sup>26</sup>  
—19 he asks Saṁjaya how the battle is proceeding Saṁjaya relates that  
enemies and allies, preceded by Arjuna and Kṛṣṇa blow their horns  
—25 Then Arjuna commands <sup>27</sup> Kṛṣṇa his charioteer, to drive his chariot  
in between both armies Kṛṣṇa obeys and then points to the enemy's  
—27 commanders "Those are the men your people will defeat " But in spite  
of the treacherous attacks <sup>28</sup> which Arjuna <sup>29</sup> and his brothers have  
suffered from Dhrtarastra and in spite of the fact that the Supreme  
Person himself is on his side, Arjuna is struck by compassion and  
anxiety about his dharma and he refuses to enter into battle

##### 2 *Arjuna's dilemma*

1—7 When admonished by Kṛṣṇa not to avoid the battle, Arjuna formu-  
lates his dilemma I should not slay my gurus I do not consider it an  
objection that in that case they will slay me, for it is better that they,  
who are ignorant of dharma and adharma, kill us than that we, who  
know what dharma and adharma are, win a victory contrary to dharma  
by killing them Then Arjuna asks Kṛṣṇa's advice

<sup>26</sup> *sarvātmanāndhaḥ*, V *na kevalam cakṣuṣā* (Dh being born blind) *paratreha*  
*na hitam ajānatā manasāpi*

<sup>27</sup> that Kṛṣṇa, God himself, has a subaltern position is explained by his love

<sup>28</sup> R eg the treason of the lacquer house, for the story see MBh 1, 313

<sup>29</sup> A is called *dirghabandhu-*, V proposes two explanations the former of  
which is preferable 'having a great number (long line) of relatives on the battle-  
field.'

## 3 God's answer

God knows that Arjuna, urged by misplaced love and pity,<sup>30</sup> looks 8-9  
upon the ksatriya's highest dharma as adharma. Arjuna has now  
resorted to him and He knows that Arjuna's perplexity cannot be helped  
unless he realizes 1 what the ātman essentially is,<sup>31</sup> and 2 that one's  
own dharma if observed disinterestedly, is a means of obtaining valid  
knowledge<sup>32</sup> of the essential being of the ātman. These are the reasons  
why God reveals<sup>33</sup> to Arjuna the doctrine of the ātman.

Arjuna is perplexed because he does not know what ātman and 10  
body are exactly, nevertheless he talks about dharma and adharma as  
though he knows that the ātman is different from the body.<sup>34</sup> So here  
is a contradiction. Therefore God speaks<sup>35</sup> to Arjuna of

- 1 the exact knowledge of the ātman and the Supreme Ātman
- 2 karma-, jñāna- and bhaktiyoga as various means of obtaining  
this knowledge

There is, as has been said above, a contradiction between, on the 11  
one hand, Arjuna's grief which makes him say 'I shall not kill them,'  
which proves that Arjuna has no insight into the distinct natures of  
body and ātman, for those who do have this insight do not mourn over  
bodies that have died or over ātmans that have not died and on the  
other hand, his appeal to dharma and adharma when he says 'Their  
ancestors will fall down when the oblations of pindas and water are  
neglected,' which could only result from the knowledge of the natures  
of body and ātman.<sup>36</sup> Hence it follows that Arjuna does not know

- 1 what the nature of the body is that it is subjected to develop-  
ments and naturally involves birth and death so that it cannot cause  
any grief if it dies,

- 2 that the ātman is different from the body and immortal that

<sup>30</sup> R borrows his terminology (*asthānasamupasthitasnehakārūnya*) from Y,  
GAS 5 cf Ch II

<sup>31</sup> *jāthātmyajñāna* 'knowledge conformable to the exact nature of' cf  
Lacombe ASV p 52 compare GBh 332 *cetahkārṇam hi vastu-jāthātmyam*  
*scayah*

<sup>32</sup> *jāthārthajñāna jāthārthya* validity of knowledge

<sup>33</sup> R *sāstrā atarāna* borrowed from Y GAS 5 which is quoted

<sup>34</sup> *dehatiriktātmanajñānanamittam*

<sup>35</sup> R God's exposition comprises 212-1866

<sup>36</sup> *prajñāvadāms* G = R *patanti* *itādikān dehātmasvabhāvaprajñānimit*  
*tāvādāms* on *prajñāvadā* cf Edgerton G I p 180 n 1 R's meaning is  
that A's words imply some sort of knowledge about body and ātman (viz. that  
the ā survives the body) but that this knowledge is contradicted by his behaviour  
( i.e. his refusal to fight)

it is not subjected to birth or death and so cannot cause any grief, because it cannot die,

3 that the dharma is a means of realizing the ātman that the battle, if disinterestedly entered upon, is a means of realizing what the ātman exactly is

## B DISCUSSION OF BODY AND ĀTMAN

### 1 *Plurality of the individual ātmans*

- 12 God declares "I, the Lord, have always existed and will always exist, and likewise the individual ātmans, Arjuna and all others, who are subject to My lordship,"<sup>37</sup> have always existed and will always exist. No doubt can be entertained that I who am the Lord, the Supreme Ātman am immortal, likewise Arjuna and all others, though being mere ksetrajñas — nothing but ātmans — should be considered immortal."

This means that on the strength of the authority of God himself who is teaching Arjuna the truth<sup>38</sup> we have to admit

- 1 that there is difference between God and the individual ātmans,
- 2 that there is difference between the individual ātmans themselves,

3 that this difference is absolutely real

To this admission however, various objections are raised

- 1 by those who hold the view that such a difference only exists as far as the ātman is subjected to upādhis<sup>39</sup>

*Refutation* The object of the text is the teaching of the truth. So when in the course of this teaching the view is held that this difference really does exist, then it is not possible to contend that this difference does not exist. Moreover, the view of the Gītā that this difference exists is supported by the evidence of the śruti<sup>40</sup>

<sup>37</sup> *īśitavyāḥ kṣetrajñāḥ kṣetrajñā-* "ātman as the knower of the body", cf. GBh 13.2 *īśitavya* "subject to God the *īśvara*."

<sup>38</sup> In the following demonstration R reasons from the assumption that G is *upadeśa* "instruction in the truth"

<sup>39</sup> viz the adherents of *bhedābheda* vada, *upādhi* "limiting adjunct" on the *bhedābheda* view see GBh 11.4 (Th 192-195) where the doctrine is refuted and Ved 14 where it is briefly stated. On the school see Śrinivasachari *Bhedābheda* vada.

<sup>40</sup> *ÇvetUp* 6.13 *nityo nityānām cetanas cetanānām eko bahūnām yo vidadhāt kāmān*

2 by those who consider the theory of difference ■ result of Nescience<sup>41</sup>

*Refutation* In that case it would be absurd that the Supreme Person would hold that view and act consistently with it, e.g. by teaching this view. It is preposterous to assume that this view is nothing but a result of Nescience, for there could not have been Nescience and consequently this view, because the Supreme Person, who naturally holds ■ view which is in harmony with the truth, would have known that the atman were non-differenced, unchangingly eternal Consciousness,<sup>42</sup> in other words, it is absurd to suppose that the Supreme Person holds the wrong view while holding the true one.

3 So, if one is consistent, one has to demonstrate that the Supreme Person is ignorant<sup>43</sup>

*Refutation* But in that case his teaching of the truth cannot be truly called so, for his contention being rooted in ignorance and therefore false would be no less false than Arjuna's contention which it pretends to correct.

4 Or it might be contended that the Supreme Person has eventually arrived at the true knowledge that no such difference actually exists, his view that such a difference does exist could be explained as a case of *bādhitanuvṛtti*,<sup>44</sup> the persistence of knowledge already sublated, then his view would not hold good as in the case of the burnt cloth.<sup>45</sup>

*Refutation* This argument is not appropriate as

■ an example will show a mirage might be cognized as an oasis,<sup>46</sup> this cognition will be sublated by the superseding cognition that it is not an oasis but a mirage. But even if this sublated cognition keeps persisting, it can never be acted upon, e.g. by fetching water from that mirage. In the same manner the cognition of the existence of Difference which would be sublated by the superseding cognition of Non-difference.

<sup>41</sup> the adherents of advaitavāda whose doctrine R sums up in CBh 1.1.1 (Th p 38-39) and Ved 12.13

<sup>42</sup> as it is acc. to advaita R's reasoning is: difference cannot be an effect of nescience, for God who teaches it, is not subject to nescience — NB Throughout *anādyā* in the advaitic sense is rendered by "nescience", in R's sense by "ignorance"

<sup>43</sup> this is indeed a logical consequence only if God is subject to nescience he can be expected to expound a theory effected by nescience

<sup>44</sup> on *bādhitanuvṛtti* as a special feature of advaitic argumentation, see Varadachari Theory of knowledge II 93 where this passage is discussed

<sup>45</sup> in a burnt cloth the likeness of a serviceable cloth may persist though it is no longer serviceable

<sup>46</sup> this cognition, parenthetically is of the real cf CBh 1.1.1, p 99 (Th p 122)

rence,<sup>47</sup> might persist, but still it could never be acted upon, e.g. by teaching this cognition as the true one, because it would be positively known that the content of this cognition is false

b It is not possible to contend that the Lord was originally nescient and that in his case there is an instance of persistence of sublated cognition, as He would have obtained the knowledge of the truth later on through the doctrine of Non difference, as it is, this contention is contradicted by *śruti* and *smṛti*.<sup>48</sup>

c Moreover it might be asked "If the Supreme Person and the succession of present gurus are certain that the *ātman* is essentially non differenced — although their preceding erroneous cognition of Difference may persist —, to whom, then, do they teach that the *ātman* is non differenced?" If one is to answer "To Arjuna etc. whom one knows to be reflected images of oneself," then this is not tenable for nobody unless he were senseless, would, while recognizing images of himself reflected in mirrors and the like and knowing them to be absolutely identical with himself, attempt to teach them anything

d One is not even justified in calling this a case of persistence of sublated cognition, for Nescience and its consequences and therefore also the erroneous notion that the *ātman*s are differenced, would have been annulled by the superseding cognition that they are non-differenced.<sup>49</sup> Persistence of sublated cognition applies only to a case like that of the cognition that there are two moons for the source of such cognition, viz. the defect of a real affliction of the eyes, cannot be annulled by the cognition that there is only one moon.<sup>50</sup> To be sure, such an erroneous notion will, even if it persists, be devoid of all significance because it is sublated by very convincing evidence.<sup>51</sup> In our

<sup>47</sup> i.e. assuming the *advaita* doctrine is true

<sup>48</sup> R quotes *MundUp* 119 *ÇvetUp* 68 G 7,26

<sup>49</sup> for *bādhitānūriti* — it is required that the ground (*hetu*) of the erroneous notion however insignificant in itself, is real and persists. Nescience not being real or at its best being neither real nor unreal, cannot be a sufficient ground for the persisting of an erroneous notion. cf. *ÇBh* 1,1,1, p. 8 in the same connection *jñānotpattā apī mithyārūpāyās tasyā* (sc. *vāsanāyā*) *anvṛttāu nivarāṇ-kāntarābhūta kadācid apī nāsyā vāsanāyā nṛtyti* / *vāsanākāryam bheda-jñānam chinna-mūlam atha cānūvartata itī bāhasabhāṣitam*

<sup>50</sup> cf. *ÇBh* 111 p. 9 (Th p. 14) *dvicandrajñānādau tu bādhakasamūdhāv apī mithyājñānāhetoh paramārthatimirādidoṣasya jñānabādha-ātrābhāvenānāṣṭatāt* *mithyājñānānūvṛttir āruddha*

<sup>51</sup> *prabala-pramāṇabādhitatena* same expression *ÇBh* 1,1,1 p. 9 where Lacombe Notes 100 remarks, d'après le Pt V Sh Abhyankar l'expression *prabala-pramāṇa* se justifie par la force (non pas épistémologique mais physique) de la source d'erreur (here the ocular affliction *timira* —) qu'il s'agit de combattre

case, however, any persistence of sublated knowledge would be utterly impossible, for the cognition that there is Difference would, with content and cause, have been annulled as being unreal by the sublating cognition that there is no such Difference

e. Therefore, if one were to demonstrate: "The Lord and the succession of present gurus do have knowledge of the truth,"<sup>52</sup> then their theory of the existence of Difference and their teaching of this theory would consequently be impossible. If, on the other hand, one would contend that they do hold the theory of Difference, then they would be nescient because their Nescience — the source of their theory — would have persisted and in that case teaching of the truth would a fortiori be impossible.

f. Furthermore, a guru's teaching of a pupil would be purposeless, for the cognition that Brahman as well as the ātmans exist (that is, the cognition of Difference), and the effect<sup>53</sup> of his cognition (teaching this cognition as the true one) would be sublated in consequence of the guru's knowledge that the ātman is really non-differenced. If, then, one is to contend: "The guru and his knowledge exist only in the imagination of the pupil,"<sup>54</sup> then the guru's knowledge cannot sublate the pupil's knowledge because the pupil and his knowledge are also imagined!<sup>55</sup> If one is to answer: "Granted that the pupil's knowledge too exists only in imagination, then the guru's knowledge would still sublate the pupil's knowledge, because the former contradicts the latter," then I say. "No, for the same applies to the guru's knowledge, and in that case the pupil's knowledge would be capable of sublating the guru's knowledge, and then all teaching would be purposeless!"

This discussion of erroneous notions may suffice

— The *grāmāna* meant here is the *pratyakṣa* — In itself the vision of a double moon is of the real cf. *CBh* 1,1,1, p. 99-100 (Th. p. 123-124)

<sup>52</sup> i.e. truth in the advaitin's sense

<sup>53</sup> V explains *śakāryasya śiṣyācāryatvāder apiti bhāvaḥ | tenopadeśābhāvaḥ praśrabhāva upadesa-parīkarābhāvas cety ukto bhavati*, in other words, if the teacher knows that Brahman solely exists, then all knowledge of difference, and consequently all relations between teacher and pupil are non-existent, teaching would be by the same of the same and therefore purposeless

<sup>54</sup> because of his nescience the pupil imagines the really non-existent relation teacher-pupil

<sup>55</sup> for, if the relation teacher pupil is imagined, the pupil himself is also imagined — Read *kalpitatvāt* for *kalpitvāt*

## 2. *Ātman and Body.*

### a. *Relation between ātman and body.*

- 13 The ātmans can give no reason for grief, for they are immortal. One does not mourn over the embodied ātman when it passes from one stage to another.<sup>56</sup> But these immortal ātmans are subject to beginningless karman, and are, for this reason, created conjointly with bodies that are determined by their various karman. BY means of these bodies the ātmans perform acts which are prescribed by the śāstras to each station and stage of life, not for the sake of the results of their acts but to be released from their bondage to these bodies. So the ātmans have inevitably contacts with objects through the senses of their bodies
- 14 and these contacts cause sensations of pain and pleasure. These contacts with objects<sup>57</sup> should be suffered until the acts have been performed. If one is persistent, one will be able to endure them, for they are transient by nature, i.e. the transitory and the transitoriness will cease to exist as such, as soon as the evil which has caused the ātmans'
- 15 bondage has been annihilated. Therefore one should persist in performing acts and one should consider the pain, which inevitably accompanies the performance of acts, as pleasure. If one performs acts, not for the sake of their results but because they are means of attaining immortality, then one will attain immortality. One is capable of doing so precisely because the ātmans are immortal.
- 16 Returning to the topic that the immortality of the ātmans and the mortality of the bodies can cause no grief, it is further demonstrated that the body, being a perishable entity, cannot be imperishable and that the ātman, being an imperishable entity, cannot be perishable. If one positively apprehends both entities body and ātman and consequently perceives what they are, one will at the same time perceive this conclusion<sup>58</sup> that the body, being a perishable entity, is essentially perishable and that the ātman, being an imperishable entity, is essent-



ially imperishable<sup>59</sup> The terms *sattva* and *asattva* in the text have the sense of perishableness and imperishableness This verse cannot refer to *Asatkāryavāda* as it has nothing to do with it Only the difference between the natures of body and *ātman*, viz their perishableness and imperishableness respectively, is under discussion here

b *Proofs for the immortality of the ātman and the mortality of the body*

The entity *atman*,<sup>60</sup> which is a spiritual being, pervades<sup>61</sup> the non-spiritual entity which is different from the *atman* Hence it follows that the *ātman* is subtler than all other beings which necessarily must be grosser if the *atman* is to pervade them Now, the thing that destroys must be subtler than the thing it destroys, for it can only destroy by pervading a thing and thereby decomposing it<sup>62</sup> Nothing, however, is subtle enough to pervade the *ātman*, so the *atman* is indestructible<sup>63</sup>

The body, however, is perishable The word *deha* proves that a body is a quantity that can be increased<sup>64</sup> Now things that are characterized by their liability to increase or decrease, e.g. jugs are finite Thus bodies are finite<sup>65</sup> Those bodies, which are conglomerated elements, serve to enable their innate *atmans* to undergo their previous *karman*<sup>66</sup> If, therefore, that *karman* is consumed, then the bodies will perish

Further, the *atman* is eternal because it is not the object<sup>67</sup> but the subject of knowledge<sup>68</sup> Therefore the *atman*, forming a unity by itself, cannot be understood to exist in a plurality of forms or to be liable to increase and decrease in the proposition 'In all the various parts of my body I know this or that', something different from the body is

<sup>59</sup> R quotes \ P 2 12 41 44 2 14 23 24 2 13 95 G 2 17 18

<sup>60</sup> *ātmatali* is the category of *atman* the expression is used to account for the neuter *tad* in G

<sup>61</sup> *tatam* G = R 2 14 17 18

<sup>62</sup> R. adduces an instance hammers too can only destroy an object by rousing wind through violent contact with the object the wind pervades and decomposes the object

<sup>63</sup> this is a complete syllogism *pratijñā* the *atman* is indestructible *hetu* because it is subtler and cannot be pervaded *udāharana* hammers can only destroy by pervading an object *upamāna* whatever is subtler cannot be destroyed by what is grosser *niṣamāna* the *atman* is indestructible

<sup>64</sup> *dīha upacaya ity upacayārūpā ime dehāḥ*

<sup>65</sup> this too is a complete syllogism

<sup>66</sup> BĀU 4 4 5 is quoted

<sup>67</sup> G *aprameya*

<sup>68</sup> G 131 is quoted *etad yo zetti tam prāhuḥ kṣetrajña ity tadvidah*

## 2 Atman and Body

### ■ Relation between ātman and body

- 13 The ātmans can give no reason for grief, for they are immortal. One does not mourn over the embodied ātman when it passes from one stage to another<sup>56</sup>. But these immortal ātmans are subject to beginningless karman, and are, for this reason, created conjointly with bodies that are determined by their various karman. By means of these bodies the ātmans perform acts which are prescribed by the sāstras to each station and stage of life not for the sake of the results of their acts but to be released from their bondage to these bodies. So the ātmans have inevitably contacts with objects through the senses of their bodies.
- 14 and these contacts cause sensations of pain and pleasure. These contacts with objects<sup>57</sup> should be suffered until the acts have been performed. If one is persistent, one will be able to endure them, for they are transient by nature, i.e. the transitory and the transitoriness will cease to exist as such as soon as the evil which has caused the ātmans' bondage has been annihilated. Therefore one should persist in performing acts and one should consider the pain, which inevitably accompanies the performance of acts, as pleasure. If one performs acts, not for the sake of their results but because they are means of attaining immortality, then one will attain immortality. One is capable of doing so precisely because the ātmans are immortal.
- 15
- 16 Returning to the topic that the immortality of the ātmans and the mortality of the bodies can cause no grief, it is further demonstrated that the body, being a perishable entity, cannot be imperishable and that the ātman, being an imperishable entity, cannot be perishable. If one positively apprehends both entities body and ātman and consequently perceives what they are, one will at the same time perceive this conclusion<sup>58</sup> that the body, being a perishable entity, is essentially perishable and that the ātman, being an imperishable entity, is essentially

<sup>56</sup> further on R will demonstrate that death is but a stage of development to be passed like youth and maturity

<sup>57</sup> R the objects sound etc, and their bases are called *mātras* because they are effected by the *tanmātras*. V this against C who (GBh 2.14) explains *mātrā* *abhir mīyante sabdādya ity evatrādīnīndriyāni*. Acc to V a substance differentiated by qualities is effected by the *tanmātras* (cf YID 4 p 40), viz the subtle elements of sound (*sabdāmātra*) etc. Cause and effect being essentially the same (*satkārya-vada*-doctrine) the word *mātra* may be used for the effects of the *mātras*, viz the primordial elements

<sup>58</sup> R *nirṇayāntatvān nirūpāṇīya nirṇaya śāntasabdhenocāte*

Besides, even in case you consider the ātman identical with the body, you are still not allowed to mourn over death, for the body is by nature subjected to developments and therefore subjected to rise and decline. What has originated will inevitably perish and what has perished will inevitably originate. How should this be understood, this originating of an entity that has perished, for have we not learnt by apprehension that only an existent entity can originate and no non-existent one? <sup>72</sup> Indeed, this holds true, for origination, annihilation etc. are only different stages of development of an existent entity. For example, threads — which are existent entities — are called clothes when they are arranged in a particular way, even the *asatkāyavadin* will admit this much. One cannot maintain that a cloth is as a substance different from the threads of which it consists, simply because it differs from those threads in that it is a particular arrangement of them. No more tenable is the view that cloth and threads are different substances simply because they are effected by different causal operations, are known under different names and used for different practical purposes.

Origination, annihilation etc., therefore, are only various stages of development of an existent entity. "An entity perishes" means that an entity which was at the stage of originating now enters the opposite stage. No entity, if subject to developments, can avoid passing through such a sequence of developments: clay becomes a clot, a jug, a bowl, and finally grains. Now, even that very little grief which could be felt over an entity's passing from one stage of development to another, is not even possible with human beings etc., for the first stage of these existent entities is not known and their final stage is not known either, only the middle stage is known. So it cannot be a reason for grief if human beings etc. appear in these modes of existence.

Arjuna should look upon this warfare as his dharma, a dharma of the same order as that of *agnisoma* sacrifices. Such warfare is most salutary to a *ksatriya*. <sup>73</sup> The immolation of the sacrificial animal at *agnisoma* sacrifices cannot be regarded as *himsa*, for according to the *śruti* <sup>74</sup> the victim, when having abandoned an inferior body — a he-goat's etc. —, will attain heaven etc. with a beautified body. It has been said above <sup>75</sup> that those who have been killed in battle will receive a more beautiful body in return, the immolation of a victim at rites such

<sup>72</sup> this is the *satkāyavada* view

<sup>73</sup> R quotes G 18.43

<sup>74</sup> R quotes *TaittBr* 3.7.7, 14

<sup>75</sup> G 2.22

understood to be the knower, and this knower exists as a unity because it is not experienced as being different in different members of the body it knows

Summing up the atman is eternal because 1 being a unit it is not liable to increase or decrease, 2 it is the subject of knowledge, 3 it pervades all that is different from itself. The body is perishable because 1 being liable to increase or decrease it exists in a plurality of forms, 2 it serves to enable its innate atman to undergo its karman, 3 it can be pervaded

19 Therefore, nobody can kill the atman, the verb *to kill* means nothing  
20 but *to separate the atman from the body*. The atman is not subject to developments because it is eternal. So it is not born when the body is born and does not die when the body dies, whether in individual life or in cosmic life. It does not suffer developments like the prakṛti does, so nothing has preceded it.<sup>69</sup> All these arguments prove that grief for the atman results from a misconception. The innate ātman cannot be  
21 destroyed even if its body be destroyed. This nature is common to all embodied atmans, so they are essentially equal and eternal, inequality and perishableness are brought about by the body

—24 Nothing whatever can have hold on the atman for the ātman will  
25 always be subtler than any other entity, and so it is eternal. It escapes the pramanas by which all other entities are verified,<sup>70</sup> so it is of an entirely different order. Consequently it cannot be thought of in the terms of these entities, therefore it is not subjected to transformations  
29 This is why positive knowledge of the atman is so difficult to obtain and why any information one gathers about the atman will rarely be true

c *What is death?*

22 Killing means nothing but "separating the atman the body". Yet it might be said that even if this be so this very separation may be reason enough for grief when the body — the instrument of pleasant experiences — perishes. No, is the answer, on the contrary the annihilation of the body is a reason for joy for when one has abandoned one's body in lawful warfare then, so the sastras assert,<sup>71</sup> one will receive a beautified body in return, it is like throwing away one's old dress and putting on a new one

<sup>69</sup> = G purāṇa

<sup>70</sup> G *avyakta*— here and elsewhere taken not in its Sāṃkhyan sense of unevolved *matter* but as not verified not verifiable by pramanas i.e. the *ātman*

<sup>71</sup> see infra at 31

## II KARMAYOGA AND JÑANAYOGA

### A KARMAYOGA

#### 1 Definition

In the previous sections the buddhi concerning the atman<sup>77</sup> has been discussed, presently the buddhi concerning yoga is under discussion. Yoga is the application<sup>78</sup> of the buddhi to the performance of acts presupposing the above knowledge of the atman, as being a means of attaining release. By applying the buddhi to one's acts one will be delivered from these acts, that is from samsara.

#### 2 Two kinds of buddhis

The text discriminates between two kinds of buddhi

a a buddhi marked by decision,

b a buddhi not marked by decision

a The buddhi that is marked by decision is concerned with those acts which an aspirant<sup>79</sup> should perform to attain release. It is marked by decision because it presupposes decisive knowledge of the proper form of the atman. With all various acts it remains essentially the same because it concerns those acts in so far as they lead to the same result, release. The purpose of the sastras is always this same result, so the buddhi concerned with all various acts prescribed by the sastras is always the same.

b The buddhi that is not marked by decision is concerned with desiderative acts<sup>80</sup>. When acts are performed in order to materialize certain desires then no more is required than the knowledge that the atman as an entity differs from the prakṛiti. The decisive knowledge of the proper form of the atman is not needed for that, for the desire for a certain result — e.g. heaven —, the execution of the means leading to

<sup>77</sup> R explains G *sāṃkhyā* as atman *sāṃkhyā* = buddhi / buddhyāvadha  
*rañyam ātmatattvam sāṃkhyam ātmatattva* the generic category atman, cf  
 V *buddhi* is 'discerning knowledge with an intellectual and conative aspect  
 (hence it is *niscaya* or *adhyavasāyatmika* (VAK sv) containing a decision  
 to act) for all knowledge must be workable. Tarkasamgraha Buddhikhaṇḍa  
*sarvajñārahatur guṇo buddhir jñānam* cf Śrīmadbhāṣya VA p 320 and  
 Lacombe ASV p 141 ff the intellectual aspect of *buddhi* is treated of in  
 2.12.30 its conative or practical aspect is now under discussion

<sup>78</sup> *yoga* in the sense of 'connection etc

<sup>79</sup> viz to release *mumukṣu*

<sup>80</sup> *nitya-* *naimitika-* and *kāmya* are rendered by periodical occasional and desiderative throughout

as agnīśoma sacrifices is, therefore, not himsa but is actually a way of protecting the victim, and as such comparable to the treatment with a thorn by a physician

### 3 Moral conclusion

Such warfare which causes immeasurable bliss, is the share of none but a ksatriya of good kṛman. If in his ignorance Arjuna refrains, after having already begun, from waging the war which is his dharma, he will be deprived of the immeasurable bliss which results from the observance of dharma and of the fame of victory, so he will gain nothing by it but evil. Moreover, everybody, expert or no expert, will cry shame upon him and that disgrace will be worse than death for a hero like he. It does not count that he refrains from battling because of his love and compassion for his relatives, such a thing does not happen and nobody will believe him, instead they will think that fear makes him do so. Then they will disparage his heroism. Death is preferable to such disparagement.

Therefore both alternatives either that he kills his enemies or that his enemies kill him are to be preferred to his refusal to enter into battle. In the first case he will, when killed, participate in supreme bliss, and in the latter case he will enjoy his kingdom without rivals when they are killed and, moreover, enjoy supreme bliss because his dharma, if observed disinterestedly will lead thereto. So Arjuna is exhorted to engage himself in the battle while realizing that this battle is a means of attaining release which is defined as man's supreme end.<sup>76</sup> If one aspires to release one will wage war with the certain knowledge that the atman is different from the body that it has nothing in common with corporeal nature and that it is eternal. One would not allow one's mind to be darkened by pleasure or pain, gain or loss, victory or defeat, whatever contingency may result from the sword-strokes which are inevitable in a war. One would not aim at the direct result of that war — heaven etc. —, but fix oneself on nothing but one's actions as such.

<sup>76</sup> *śaramaṇurīṣṭīrīlalakṣaṇamokṣa*, the saṃsāric *puṇyārthas* are dharma, artha and kāma

If the Vedas would not do so, those people would turn away from release owing to their rajas and tamas, for release can only be attained by one who is possessed of sattva alone, then they would not learn by what means they would be able to attain the bliss for which they are still qualified, and they would perish, because their inclination to desirable objects would have incapacitated them, and they would regard the wrong means as right

One should not be possessed of all three gunas but cultivate the sattva then one will be released from samsāra nature<sup>80</sup> and one's sattva will increase. How should this be done? One should search for the proper form of the ātman by not acquiring objects that are neither comprised by the proper form of the ātman nor comprised by the means by which one can realize this form, and by not keeping those objects when one does already possess them<sup>87</sup>

Besides, one should not accept all which is taught by the Vedas, 46 just as a thirsty man does not take more water from a public reservoir than he is in need of, so a Vedic aspirant<sup>89</sup> to release should not take more from the Vedas than his release requires. No more is required 47 than this when performing periodical, occasional and desiderative acts which according to the śruti lead to certain results, one should consider the act in itself reason enough to perform it<sup>88</sup> and not its result, for any result makes another tie, but resultless acts which are performed to propitiate God serve to release. Therefore, one should not oneself be the reason of acts and results,<sup>90</sup> this means that if one aspires to release and if one's sattva is increasing one cannot be regarded as the agent of acts, even though one performs acts nor as the reason of their results, for example, when eating of the resulting satiation<sup>91</sup> 48 When one realizes this, one must not remain inactive but one must

<sup>80</sup> *nirvāṇandvāḥ* G = R *nirgatasakalasāmsarīkasvabhāvaḥ*

<sup>87</sup> R's paraphrasis of G *niryogakṣema aprāptasya prāptir yogaḥ* (<y connection etc.) *prāptasya parivakṣanam kṣemaḥ* (<kṣ safety keeping safe)

<sup>88</sup> R explains G *brāhmaṇa* by *auśika* a person who observes the Veda (brahmasambandī *brāhmaṇaḥ brahman* in its sense of sacred uttering scripture) and G *vijñānt* by *vedārtham vijñānaḥ munukṣuḥ* the sole purpose of the Veda being release see supra st 41

<sup>89</sup> *ka mānātre dhikārah*

<sup>90</sup> R interprets *karmaphalāhetu* not as a *bahuvrīhi* (whose motivation is the result of his acts) but as a *tatpuruṣa* the first member of which is a *dvandva* *karmāhetu* being the agent of one's acts *phalāhetu* being the cause of the result of one's acts

<sup>91</sup> R refers to G 3.29.30 where both *karmāhetutva* and *phalāhetutva* are attributed to the gunas and to God

that result, and the enjoyment of that result are perfectly possible and not all incompatible without such a decisive knowledge.<sup>81</sup> Buddhis concerned with desiderative acts are numberless, because the results of those acts are numberless. Besides, various acts, even if ordered to obtain a single result, have many branches, because the same acts may have a number of adventitious results.

- 44 Now, when one performs acts of a periodical and occasional nature — the same applies to desiderative acts —, one must renounce all results — the main as well as the adventitious ones — which those acts have, according to the śruti. They should be performed to one purpose, release, for this is the only purpose of the śāstras. The unwise who do not do so but who stick to the Vedas inasmuch as these promise such results as heaven etc. and contend that there are no other results because they do not want any other (a contention<sup>82</sup> which leads to ever new births when that result is ended and which leads one astray because one does not know the truth), and who desire pleasure and power and, owing to such talk about pleasure and power, lose all knowledge of the ātman, these unwise people will never form in their minds<sup>83</sup> the above buddhi marked by decision and concerned with acts that result in release and therefore presuppose decisive knowledge of the proper form of the ātman.

### 3. The teaching of the Vedas.

- 45 *Question.* If acts should be performed, not to obtain their results but to attain release, why should the Vedas prescribe such acts that have only infinitesimal results and lead only to new births? Are they not active<sup>84</sup> in securing the sustenance of the ātman? Then how could it be contended that their teaching should be neglected?

*Answer.* The Vedas address themselves to those in whom the three guṇas, sattva, rajas and tamas, preponderate<sup>85</sup> and they explain to them to what ends their guṇas allow them to aspire, — heaven and the like.

<sup>81</sup> read *svārūpyāthātmyaniścaye 'sati* for ... *sati* (cf. V. *yāthātmyaniścayābhāve*).

<sup>82</sup> note R.'s expl. of G. *puṣpīlām vācam: puṣpamātraphalām apātarāmaṇīyām* "the fruit of which is only flowers: delightful but for a moment."

<sup>83</sup> *samādhiyate 'smiṇ ātmajñānam iti samādhir manaḥ.*

<sup>84</sup> R. because of a love greater than that of thousands of parents; same expression ÇBh. 3.3.39 (Th. p. 662).

<sup>85</sup> *trayo guṇās traigunyam... sattvarajastamaḥpracurāḥ puṇḥās traigunyaśabdenocyante.*



## 5. The Contemplation of the ātman.

Yoga<sup>98</sup> is the contemplation of the ātman resulting from that performance of acts which presupposes true knowledge of the ātman and is elevated<sup>99</sup> by this special buddhi. One has heard<sup>100</sup> God demonstrate that this buddhi is concerned with the eternal ātman which belongs to a different class from all other entities, is most subtle and forms a unity of its own. Now, when this buddhi is immovably fixed in one's mind<sup>101</sup> which has been purified by disinterested activity, one will attain yoga, i.e. the contemplation of the ātman, or, in other words, karmayoga that is preceded by true knowledge of the ātman obtained from the śāstras will lead to jñānanisthā or sthūtaprajñatā and jñānanisthā again will lead to yoga or the contemplation of the ātman.

### B JÑĀNAYOGA

#### 1. Four degrees of jñānanisthā

**Question** What is jñānanisthā and how does a sthūtaprajña perform acts?

**Answer.** There are four degrees of jñānanisthā<sup>102</sup>

1. when one focuses the mind on nothing but the ātman and, being content with that, expels all other desires,
2. when one is a muni<sup>103</sup> who is not grieved whenever there is reason, who has no desire for pleasing objects and who is exempt from wishful thought, fear and anger;<sup>104</sup>
3. when one is indifferent to pleasing objects and exempt from joy and hatred;

<sup>98</sup> this yoga- should not be confused with the yoga- of st 50 which is buddhiyoga- "the application of the buddhi to activity" (supra st 39), yoga- here is called the result of activity with buddhiyoga and the goal of it (lakṣya-, term borrowed from Y, GAS 6)

<sup>99</sup> samākṛta-

<sup>100</sup> śrūtiḥ prapannā G = R asmāta śraavanena (viz G 2,17 30) viśeṣataḥ prapannā

<sup>101</sup> samādhi- explained by manas, as supra n 83

<sup>102</sup> the first is better than the second etc

<sup>103</sup> muni- always explained by ātmamanānasila- (pseudo etymology from √man-) cf CBh 4.4.46 (Th p 710) idam ca mannam śravanapratigīhārthān mananād arthāntarabhūtam upāsānāmbanasya punah punah samīlanam lābhānandānām

<sup>104</sup> rāga-, bhaya- and krodha-, defined resp anāgateṣu spṛhā priyaḥ śleṣāpripriyāgamāhetubhāceta- yāgamāhetudarśanamittam dukkham, priyaḥ śleṣāpripriyāgamāhetubhāceta- nāntarayatadukkhahetuh samamotikārah

perform acts disinterestedly and with equanimity at their failure or success

#### 4 The greatness of karmayoga

- 40 This way of acting is a most eminent one, for in karmayoga one is never deprived of the results of one's acts, once their performance has commenced, even if they are discontinued or interrupted. Even though partially executed, the karmayoga will rescue its executor from samsara,<sup>92</sup> whereas all other means of achieving a certain end, whether laic or Vedic, do — when they are stopped — not result in the desired
- 49 end and bring their executor back to his starting-point. Therefore, an act to which the buddhi — concerned with the renunciation of the main results and with equanimity at failure or success of the adventitious ones — is being applied is far superior to acts which are performed without such buddhi, the former takes away all suffering in samsara and furthers the release, whereas the latter results in immense suffering in samsara. So when acting, one should live in<sup>93</sup> that buddhi; those
- 50 who act with interest in the results cannot avoid remaining in samsara.<sup>94</sup>
- 51 When one applies this buddhi to one's actions, one relinquishes the good and evil karman which has been collected in beginningless times, which has no end and which is the cause of one's bondage to prakṛti. Therefore, one should acquire proficiency in applying the buddhi to one's acts, for this application is the special capacity by which one is
- 52 capable of performing acts.<sup>95</sup> As the upanishads assert,<sup>96</sup> whosoever acts in this way by applying the buddhi will go to a blissful place. If one acts in this manner, then one's buddhi will be freed from its impurities and pass the delusion that is caused by interest in infinitesimal results. Then, as a consequence of what one has heard from God, viz. that one should renounce the results etc., and of what one will hear later on,<sup>97</sup> one will acquire an indifferent attitude of one's own accord.

<sup>92</sup> R aptly quotes G 6.40 *naiveha nāmūtra vimāśas tasya vidyate*, which is said of a person who has not been able to succeed in yoga.

<sup>93</sup> *saranam* G = R *śāsthanam* *tasyām etā buddhau vartasvety arīhah*

<sup>94</sup> here R interprets *phalaketavah* as a bahuvrīhi *krpānāh* G = R *samśṛīnāh*

<sup>95</sup> *karmasū kriyamaṇeṣu ayam buddhiyogah kausalam atisāmarthyam*

<sup>96</sup> expl. of G 13

<sup>97</sup> *śrotavāsya śrutasya ca* G = R *asmāta itah pūrvam tādṛgyataḥ śrutasya phalāder itah paścāc chrotavāsya ca kṛte*

able to form in his mind the buddhi that is concerned with the ātman as distinct from prakṛti, or to cultivate his knowledge of this distinct ātman by meditating on it, or to subdue his propensity to the objects, or to obtain ever the eternal perfect beatitude. When a person follows the mind while conforming to the senses operating in their objects, the mind will expel the insight that is inclined to the distinct ātman and so cause an inclination to the objects. 67

#### 4 The Contemplation of the ātman

A person who has subdued his senses and purified his mind, contemplates the ātman by means of the buddhi that is concerned with the ātman. This buddhi is dark as night to other people, but to him the second buddhi — the one concerned with objects — is as dark as night. Only such a person who is subject to no transformation whether he has sensorial impressions or not, but is contented with the contemplation of the ātman, will attain santi,<sup>109</sup> whereas a person who is transformed by the objects will find none. Only by renouncing the objects, by being exempt from all desire for them, from possessiveness and from the misconception that the body is the ātman, one will be able to contemplate the ātman and attain santi. 70 71

This position in disinterested activity which presupposes knowledge of the eternal ātman, marks the sthitaprajñā. This position will lead one to brahman<sup>110</sup> and deliver one from perplexity that is from saṃsāra. If one persists in this position until one's dying hour, one will attain the ātman which comprises nothing but beatitude.<sup>111</sup> 72

#### C RELATION KARMAYOGA - JÑĀNAYOGA

Knowledge of the ātman combined with karmayoga leads to jñānayoga,<sup>112</sup> through jñānayoga one arrives at the true contemplation of the realizing ātman.<sup>113</sup> This contemplation, again, is propaedeutic<sup>114</sup>

<sup>109</sup> *sānti* is synonymous with *prasāda* above the being freed from disturbing imperfections due to prakṛti, esp. *abhimāna*.

<sup>110</sup> = R. expl. of *brāhmī*, *brahman* here is the ātman in its pure form (*svarūpeṇa*), separated from prakṛti.

<sup>111</sup> *brahmanirvāṇam* G = R. *nirvāṇamayam brahma sukhakatānātmānam*.

— R. ends by quoting GAS 6.

<sup>112</sup> cf. supra ad G 253.

<sup>113</sup> *prāpti-ātman* (cf. R. s. etymology *ātman* <√*āp* ÇBh. 1.3.2 (Th. 297)) term derived from ChUp 8.7.1 *ya ātmā sa sarvāṇi ca lokān āpnoti*, R. quotes this śruti to corroborate his view that the contemplation of the ātman is ancillary to the attainment of God: the gist of Prajāpati's speech 8.7.1 ff corresponds to the ponds in *ātmāvalokana*, the "*daharāndya*" of 8.11-6 corresponds to the

58 4 when one focuses the mind on the atman and withdraws the senses from the objects

## 2 *The manner in which jñānaṣṭhā is achieved*

59 The senses feed on the objects. If the embodied ātman does not feed his senses then they will turn away from their objects, the hankering<sup>101</sup> after the objects will, however, remain. But even that hankering will also vanish when one has contemplated the atman. As long as this hankering does remain, the senses will keep disturbing the mind however much one strives to subdue them. Therefore jñānaṣṭhā is difficult: the subduing of the senses depends on the contemplation of the atman but the latter again depends on the former. How is one to avoid this difficulty? By focusing the mind on God who is its perfect object<sup>100</sup> and by remaining concentrated on him. Then all impurities and the hankering itself will vanish and one will be able to subdue one's senses then one will be capable of contemplating the atman. The mind will be disciplined and the inner organ purified. When the mind of the puruṣa is serene<sup>107</sup> then all suffering resulting from the blending of puruṣa and prakṛti will cease and the buddhi that is concerned with the atman as distinct from prakṛti will be fixed on God. He who focuses his mind on God and withdraws his senses from the objects will direct his vision to the atman.

## 3 *The perils of any other method*

62 When one does not in this manner focus one's mind on God but attempts to subdue one's senses on one's own account one will — in consequence of the after effects<sup>108</sup> of beginningless evil — inevitably run the risk of concentrating again on the objects. Thence will appear an increased inclination to those objects, thence anger, thence perplexity, thence loss of memory, thence the ruin of the buddhi, thence finally decay in samsara. He who does not focus his mind on God will not be

<sup>100</sup> *rasaḥ* G = R *ragah* (supra n 104)

<sup>101</sup> *cetasah subhāsrāye mayi* R quotes VP 6.7.72-73 where Viṣṇu is called *cittasthita* which occasions R's expression *cetasah subhasraya* in GBh 2.61.64 on the expression see Lacombe Note 585 ad CBh 1.11 p. 69 (Th p. 89). What R means to say is not that jñānaṣṭhā results in direct contact with God (which is only possible through bhakti) but that God assists man in subduing his mind whose perfect object is God.

<sup>107</sup> *prasāde* G = R *arjya puruṣasya manasaḥ prasāde sati prasāda* "the being *prasanna* without the prakṛti defects which are incompatible with the contemplation of the ātman", cf *sānti* n 109.

<sup>108</sup> *vāsanā*

therefore attempt karmayoga. Considering that God has said that those whose buddhi is disturbed by their senses are capable of karmayoga and that those whose buddhi is not disturbed by their senses are capable of jñānayoga, there is no contradiction at all.

## 2 It is difficult to attempt jñānayoga immediately

Jñānanisthā<sup>119</sup> — preventing the senses from operating — is not reached simply by not performing or ceasing to perform the acts prescribed by the sastras. Ātmanistha is the accomplishment of disinterested activity meant to propitiate God. So if one wishes to reach ātmanisthā,<sup>120</sup> one must be active, for that state presupposes the subduing of the senses and is therefore not attainable until the beginningless and endless evil has been annulled by disinterested acts performed to propitiate God. There is no existence without activity. The gunas of the prakṛti — sattva, rajas and tamas — increase in accordance with karman and irresistibly compel a man to be active, unless and until this karman has been annulled by karmayoga and these gunas have been conquered, the inner organ will not be purified and jñānayoga will not be practicable. If one attempts to practise jñānayoga before the evil has been annulled and the inner organ purified, one will miss one's aim,<sup>121</sup> in that case one's interest in the objects will cause one to remain fixed on them and to turn away from the atman. So one would perish even while practising jñānayoga.

## 3 Karmayoga superior to jñānayoga

Hence it follows that a person who, with a mind devoted to the contemplation of the atman, subdues his senses by performing acts according to the sāstras and with those senses attempts karmayoga disinterestedly, is even superior to that person whose position is jñānanisthā, for karmayoga will not cause a person to be negligent. The acts to be performed are of the same order as the objects with which one is familiar of old and the senses are by nature inclined to be active. With jñānayoga this is not the case.

One must be active because by nature one is conjoined with prakṛti. It is very easy to be active, for one's beginningless vasanī makes one

<sup>119</sup> *naishkarmya* interpreted as 'jñānanisthā' even as *samanyasa* infra ad G 51

<sup>120</sup> *ātmanisthā* "constant devotion to the contemplation of the atman or the means thereof" explains G adds (in the same sense in 18.46 quoted in 117). term adopted from GAS 16 *ātmanisthā*

<sup>121</sup> R. *mithyāśāstra* "one whose acts do not correspond to his will"

to bhaktiyoga, through bhakti<sup>115</sup> alone one is capable of attaining God

### 1 Elucidation

- 3, 1 *Problem* Now this should mean that karmanistha leads to jñānistha<sup>110</sup> and jñānistha leads to the contemplation of the atman. Jñānistha is making the senses and the mind *cease operating* in the objects. But God does actually urge Arjuna to be active, that is to make his senses *operate* then however, it will be impossible for him to arrive at the contemplation of the atman, for that state can only be attained by stopping the operations of the senses. Therefore, if God wishes to help Arjuna arrive at the contemplation of the atman, he should indeed urge him to make his senses and mind cease operating, that is urge him to attempt jñānistha. So here is a contradiction. God exhorts his pupil to be active in order to be inactive or, in other words, to perform acts — i.e. to make his senses operate — in order to arrive at jñānistha — i.e. to make his senses cease operating —, jñānistha itself being a means of arriving at the contemplation of the atman.
- 2 *Answer* There are two nisthas jñānistha and karmanisthā. Not everyone is capable of attempting jñānayoga, only after the impurities of his mind have been washed away and his senses have been subdued by means of disinterested karmayoga which is performed as a propitiation of God<sup>117</sup> will a person be capable of jñānayoga. Therefore jñānayoga is the position of those who have fixed the buddhi on the atman alone<sup>118</sup> and consequently are capable of jñānayoga, whereas karmayoga is the position of those who are not yet able to do so and

attainment of God (cf. CBh 3.34.2-3 (Th p. 665-667)) besides KathUp 1.2.12 proves that knowledge of the atman is ancillary to that of God. 2.18.19 elucidates the proper form of the a. 2.20.22 that of God. 2.23 proves that God can only be worshipped by bhakti and 3.9 proves that knowledge of God (para idā) results in union.

<sup>114</sup> *anga* subordinate ancillary propaedeutic matter cf. NK sv 1.11 *khyaphalāja iaktatc satī mīkl yaṭl alajanakavjāpārajanakam angam*

<sup>115</sup> R synonymous with vedana upasana dhyana etc (cf. CBh 1.11 pp. 8-10 f. (Th p. 15 ff.) and CBh 4.1.3 (Th p. 716) where the synonymy of the terms is discussed).

<sup>116</sup> *nisthā* the taking a firm stand in fixation on constant devotion to as a means of release. karmanisthā is used synonymously with karmayoga. jñānisthā with jñānayoga. the latter is discussed supra ad ¶ 54-58.

<sup>117</sup> R refers to G 18.46 *śākarmanā tatī* (God) *abhyarcya siddhiṃ vīdatī mānavaḥ* to prove that acts are propitiations of God.

<sup>118</sup> *sāṅkījānam* G = R *ātmanāṅgayayā buddhijā yuktā sāṅkījāḥ samkhyā* connoting the buddhi as witness ad ¶ 239.

*Refutation* This is only true in case the earned money is not spent in the performance of sacrifices but in gaining a personal end. Therefore one should be active in order to acquire the means for performing sacrifices and not for realizing a personal ambition. Being propitiated by such acts God will annul the beginningless *vāsanā* and grant a person the contemplation of the *ātman* without hindrance. A person who attempts to attain release by executing one of the means thereof but does not sustain his body with the remnants of sacrifices will fail to achieve his end. When creating the world God<sup>127</sup> observed that the creatures were incapacitated by their natural conjunction with beginningless *acit*, that their distinctions by name-and-form<sup>128</sup> were lost, that they were submerged in himself and that for these reasons, they were incapable of attaining one of man's major ends<sup>129</sup> and therefore only qualified for things non-spiritual, in order to resuscitate them. He compassionately created them together with sacrifices and said "By means of this sacrifice you are to cultivate your *atmans*,<sup>131</sup> this sacrifice will fulfill your aspirations to release and all other desires which are relevant to these aspirations." In what manner, then, should this be done? By sacrificing to the gods, for the gods form God's body<sup>131</sup> and God is their *ātman*, so by sacrificing to the gods one will worship God<sup>132</sup>. Then the gods have to nourish their sacrificer so that he will be able to sacrifice to them again and when sacrificer and gods are supporting one another in this way, the former will attain release. When worshipped through various sacrifices, the gods — whose *atman* is God himself — will grant their worshipper the release to which he aspires, thereafter they will grant him all other desires. But a person who does not return the desired things which the gods have granted him on the condition that they should be returned to them by means of sacrifices, is a thief: such a person is not qualified for release and he will go to hell. People partake of impurity<sup>133</sup> when they keep, cook and eat the desired things which have been granted on the condition that they should be returned. But if one accepts the desired things that have

<sup>127</sup> R. when unspecified (*nirupādhiḥ*) the word *prajāpati* refers to Nārāyaṇa. he quotes *MahānārUp* 11,3

<sup>128</sup> principles of bodily individuation, for a detailed study see Falk, *Nāmā-rūpa*

<sup>129</sup> the *puṇyārthas* *dharma*, *artha*, *kāma* and *mokṣa*

<sup>130</sup> *prasaviṣyadhvam* G = R *ātmano vṛddhiṃ kurudhvam*

cf G 7,21

<sup>131</sup> R. quotes G 9,24 *aham hi sarvayajñānām bhoktā*

<sup>132</sup> R. for this food will develop into impurity

concomitant <sup>122</sup> with activity, consequently activity will not make one negligent. This is the reason why *karmanisthā* is superior to *jñānanisthā*, even for a person who is qualified for *jñānayoga*. *jñānayoga* is difficult to practise because one is not concomitant with it, for one has never practised it before, for this same reason it will cause a person to be negligent about it. Moreover even if one performs acts one cannot be considered the real agent of these acts, <sup>123</sup> this results from the knowledge one has of the *ātman*, as will be proved later on <sup>124</sup>. So this means again that *karmayoga* is superior, because it also implies knowledge of the *ātman*.

The superiority of activity to *jñānanisthā* also applies to a person who is qualified for *jñānayoga*. If one were to renounce all activity and devote oneself exclusively to *jñānayoga*, then no physical existence would be possible, and consequently *jñānanisthā* itself would be impossible for physical existence presents the means of reaching that state. One has to sustain one's body until the means are executed. This should be done with the reminders of the *mahayajñas* <sup>125</sup> which are to be performed at the expense of honestly earned means.

Summing up, *karmayoga* is more important than *jñānayoga*, even for a person who is qualified for *jñānayoga*, because

- 1 in order to sustain his body a person has to be active in performing sacrifices and the like,
- 2 *karmayoga* also implies positive knowledge of the *ātman*,
- 3 *karmayoga*, as distinct from *jñānayoga*, does not cause a person to be negligent about it, because one is naturally conjoint with *prakṛti*.
- 4 *The acts to be performed are sacrificial acts*

- 9 *Objection*: But the performance of acts e.g. earning money, will disturb the senses, for all activity implies *ahamkāra* <sup>126</sup> and possessiveness etc., consequently the active person will be tied to *samsāra* by the *vasana* of his acts.

<sup>122</sup> *mīṣaṃ G = R tyāptam prakṛtisamsṛgṇena hi tyāptam karma prakṛti* and hence the *prakṛti* conjoined person being invariably concomitant with *karman* for in beginningless previous lives a habit (*vasana*) of activity has been formed which makes activity natural and easy as well as compulsory. This is not true for *jñānayoga* which corresponds to no *vasana*.

<sup>123</sup> cf. ad st. 30

<sup>124</sup> infra ad 4.18.24

<sup>125</sup> cf. ad st. 9. R quotes ChUp. 7.26.2 *dhārasuddhan satrasuddhiḥ* etc. and

□ 3.13 *bhūnjate te* (sc. others than *yajnasīḍṣasinaḥ*) *tv aghamī jḍḍha*

<sup>126</sup> "egoity", faculty which brings about the misconception (*abhimāna*) that the *ātman* is *prakṛti*.



would be purposeless to execute any means and not calamitous not to execute any, for he contemplates the ātman independently of any means. Such a person will turn away from all non-spiritual things of his own accord, to him no being<sup>140</sup> and its effect can be an end or a means to an end. The various means of release only serve to make a person turn away; being already released, the released one is in no need of them.

No activity in executing a means is required if a person does no longer depend on a means for his contemplation of the ātman. When, however, such activity is still required, then karmayoga is the best means to execute, because it is easy to execute, does not cause a person to be negligent about it, implies true knowledge of the ātman and because even a jñānayogin is compelled to be active in order to exist, therefore one should perform acts disinterestedly until one has attained the ātman. That karmayoga is indeed the best means even for a jñānayogin is proved by the fact that the rājarsis, who were the first of the jñānins,<sup>141</sup> have also availed themselves of karmayoga to attain the ātman.<sup>142</sup>

6 A person who carries authority is obliged to practise karmayoga

The example that is set by a person of whom it is known that he understands and observes the entire sāstra will be followed by all who have incomplete knowledge of the sāstra. When that person performs acts, even though these acts are normally performed, and performs them normatively,<sup>143</sup> then everybody will do the same. A person whose example is followed because he carries authority must perform the acts that correspond to his station and stage of life, in order to save the world. Otherwise the world will perish, and the evil that would spring thereof would naturally put an end to his own jñānayoga. An example: God is not bound to do anything, for there is no desire of his that is not fulfilled, yet He is active in order to save the world. If God in the embodiment of Kṛṣṇa Vāsudeva would not devote himself to the activities that are proper to the house of Vasudeva who is himself a leading authority, then everyone would consider that to be his dharma.

<sup>140</sup> R explains G *bhūta* by the 'elements' (*ākāśa* etc.) which are the developed forms of *prakṛti*. V adds that the mention of *development* indicates that *bhūta* ("being") means 'being subject to becoming'.

<sup>141</sup> *jñānins* - here in the sense of *jñānauṣṭha*.

<sup>142</sup> *samsiddhim āsthitāḥ* G = R *ātmānam prāptavantaḥ* cf n 120.

<sup>143</sup> *pramānam* G = R *anagayuktam* 'it to be done as an ancillary to release'.

been granted and uses them to propitiate God who is the gods' ātman, i.e. sacrifices them to propitiate God as God and feeds one's body on the remnants of them, then one will be freed of the impurities which have resulted from beginningless evil and are incompatible with the contemplation of the ātman

- 14 From the point of view of the world as well as that of the śāstras everything depends on the sacrifice beings<sup>134</sup> arise from food, food from rain, rain from sacrifice,<sup>135</sup> sacrifice from the activity of an acting person, this activity from the body,<sup>135</sup> the body depends on the individual ātman,<sup>136</sup> the composite body and ātman, again, arise from food. In this manner the bodies of all various adhikārins<sup>137</sup> are rooted in the sacrifice. The above sequence of developments is a circle, alternatively one is cause and effect of the other. A person who exists in a term of this circular development — in a body — but does not, through practising either jñānayoga or karmayoga, keep moving this circle, which is set in motion by God, by sustaining that body with the remnants of sacrifices, lives in sin<sup>138</sup>. He enjoys his senses, not his ātman, for when rajas and tamas preponderate in his body because he feeds his body on food that is not sacrificial, he will turn away from contemplating the ātman and enjoy the objects. In that case he will live in vain, even if he were to attempt jñānayoga, for his attempts will be fruitless.

### 5 Only the released need not act

- 17 Only<sup>139</sup> the released one who is fixed on the ātman of his own accord, who is content with the ātman and nothing else and to whom the ātman is everything — livelihood, nourishment, experience etc — need not, in order to contemplate the ātman, perform the acts prescribed to his station and stage of life, because he is already contemplating it independently. His contemplation does no longer depend on either of the means of release, jñānayoga and karmayoga. For such a one it

<sup>134</sup> R being (*bhāta*) means body + embodied atman

<sup>135</sup> = G *brahman-*, R refers to MuṇḍUp 1,1,9 *tad etad brahma nāmarūpam annam* and G 149 *mama jonir mahad brahma* to prove that *br* denotes the *p-akṛti*

<sup>136</sup> *akṣara* G = R *jīvātman-*, the *j* enables the body to be active and in that respect the body "springs from" derives its functions from, the *jīvātman*

<sup>137</sup> *sarvagalam brahma* G = R *sar-ādhikāragalam sarirapam* (cf || 135)

<sup>138</sup> R proposes two explanations of *aghānus-* *aghārambhāśyāśyus-* ('whose life serves to commit sin') and *aṅhāparinata- āśyus-* ('a life developed into sin')

<sup>139</sup> this expl || in keeping with R's remarks supra st 8.

should not make the ignorant and unqualified waver in their activities but set for them an example of the practice of karmayoga

## B Agency

a proved to result from the *gunas*

It does not result from the proper form of the *ātman* that the *ātman* is the agent of acts. Agency results from the natural conjunction of the *ātman* with *gunas*. By discriminating between the *ātman* with *gunas* and without *gunas* one knows that agency results from the *gunas*.

b to be attributed to God

Śruti, smṛti and Gīta<sup>149</sup> assert that the Supreme Person can actuate the *ātman*, that the *ātman* is God's body and that God actuates the *ātman* of those who are qualified for it. When it is realized that God can actuate the *ātman* because the *ātman* is God's body, then it is known that God is the performer of all acts. Therefore one should attribute all acts to God, without fostering any hope for their results but reflecting that the acts only serve to propitiate God. God himself causes his own acts to be performed by his own *ātman*<sup>150</sup> — which is the agent of those acts —, his acts are effectuated by his own causes and subservient to one end, viz the propitiation of himself. When attributing the acts to God one will not appropriate them and one will be freed from one's feverish concern of how to escape from the endless evil that has been piled up since beginningless times, for one realizes that God will cause one's bonds to be loosened when He is propitiated with acts. Realizing this one should quietly practise karmayoga.

## 9 The doctrine of the Deity in the *upanīsads*

The *śruti*<sup>151</sup> states clearly that God is the Lord of everything, that everything is a *śeṣa* of him and that He is the governor of all. Our text says that this alone is the essential teaching of the *upanīsads*<sup>152</sup> — The people who are fixed on the *ātman* and are qualified for the *sāstra*<sup>153</sup>

<sup>149</sup> R quotes Taittār 3.11.1, BĀU 3.7.22 (M), Manu 12.122 (read *prajāṣṭāraṃ* for *prasādhīṣṭāraṃ*), and G 14.15, 18.61, on the different readings of Kāṇva and Mādhyandina recensions see ÇBh 1.4.47 (Th p 403), 2.1.9 (422 f) and 2.3.19 (544).

<sup>150</sup> i.e. the *jīvātman* who is ensouled by God, cf GBh 18, 14.15.

<sup>151</sup> R quotes here esp ÇvetUp 6.7 and MahānārUp 11.3 in addition to the *śruti*s quoted n. 150.

<sup>152</sup> see Ved 11.

<sup>153</sup> that is *ātmanīṣṭhasāstra* — 'the *sāstra* treating of the *ātman*' or 'the *sāstra* of those who are *ātmanīṣṭha*' (see n. 120).

- and follow Kṛṣṇa's example. So they would come to neglect their duties and remain inactive; consequently they would not learn to know the
- 24 ātman and go to hell. All authoritative persons who would make their decision about their dharma depend upon Kṛṣṇa's conduct, would remain inactive and perish. So God would bring about chaos and cause all those people to perish. Arjuna, who is looked upon as an authority<sup>144</sup> because he is Pāṇḍu's son and Yudhiṣṭhira's brother and because he
- 25 is Arjuna, should follow God's example and practise karmayoga. In the same manner as those who have incomplete knowledge of the ātman and are therefore bound to be active have to practise karmayoga as a means of the contemplation of the ātman because they are incapable of jñānayoga which means incessantly practising the knowledge of the ātman, in that same manner should those who do have complete knowledge of the ātman and are therefore not bound to perform acts practise karmayoga, although they are qualified for jñānayoga, because they carry authority and have to make the authorities who depend on
- 26 them sure of their dharma. One should not split up the buddhis of the unqualified<sup>145</sup> by saying that there is besides karmayoga another way to the contemplation of the ātman; on the contrary, one should by setting an example of activity take care that they enjoy being active, even though one should enjoy practising jñānayoga oneself; and one should do so while realizing that karmayoga constitutes an autonomous<sup>146</sup> means of the contemplation of the ātman, apart from jñānayoga.

### 7. Acting knowingly and acting unknowingly.

- 27 A person whose ātman is concealed by the misconception that the ego is the ātman<sup>147</sup> does not know the proper form of the ātman and believes that he himself is the one who performs the acts of the guṇas.
- 28 But a person who knows the truth about the divisions of the guṇas on the one hand and the corresponding acts on the other hand, realizes that the guṇas operate at their effects<sup>148</sup> and therefore takes no interest
- 29 in the acts of the guṇas. If one is qualified for jñānayoga oneself, one

<sup>144</sup> read *Arjuno 'rjunah śiṣṭatayā vyapadeśyah*; this expression, lit. "to be recognized as a cultured man (and therefore authoritative)" I have rendered throughout by "authority".

<sup>145</sup> read with v.l. *ajñānām ātmany akṛtsnavittayā jñānayogopāpādanā-jaktānām...*

<sup>146</sup> *nirapekṣa-*.

<sup>147</sup> expl. of G. *ahamkāra-*; cf. n. 126.

<sup>148</sup> *guṇā guṇeṣu vartante* G. = R. *guṇāḥ sattvādayaḥ svaguṇeṣu sveṣu kāryeṣu vartante*; in other words, it is the guṇas which act, see below.

should beware of getting in their power, or, if one is in their power, of perishing completely by attempting jñānayoga. That is why karmayoga — which is a man's dharma<sup>157</sup> because it is easy to practice — is better than jñānayoga, even though it be performed deficiently, for karmayoga, however deficiently it be performed does not cause a man to be negligent about it, whereas jñānayoga — which is not the dharma<sup>158</sup> of a person who is conjoined with prakṛti because it is difficult for such a person to practise it — is inferior, even though it be completely performed during some time for in the end it will cause the performer to be negligent about it. For a man who lives by activity — which is his dharma because he is qualified for it — death is preferable to jñānayoga the reward of karmayoga cannot be obtained after only one existence, later on in a subsequent life karmayoga may be practised without hindrance when all impediments have been removed by the activity in a previous life. But jñānayoga is perilous because it causes a person to be negligent about it.

*Question* But what impels a man to experience the objects contrary to his own wishes when he devotes himself to jñānayoga?

*Answer* Desire. Desire arises from the rajas guna of the man who attempts jñānayoga, for being a man he is conjoint with prakṛti and prakṛti consists of gunas whose function is to originate and annihilate a man. The rajas guna arises from ancient vasana it is concerned with the objects of the senses. If desire is hindered in its operation it develops into anger<sup>159</sup> and induces a man to hurt the people who have prevented it from materializing. A creature is enveloped in desire, as fire is in smoke desire, which is insatiable by objects and therefore unending, envelops the knowledge of the atman that an individual conjoined with prakṛti possesses by nature.

*Question* By what means does desire repress the atman?

*Answer* By means of senses manas and buddhi these support desire. All three are concerned with objects, by means of them desire envelops the knowledge of the atman which a man possesses by nature, that is turns him away from this knowledge and directs him totally to the experiencing of objects. In this manner desire turns a person who

<sup>157</sup> G *śādharmā* in its widest sense the dharma of all jivas i.e. atmans conjoined with prakṛti

<sup>158</sup> G *paradharmā* in its widest sense dharma of one completely different from a jiva > a released person cf. supra st 17 20 and 18 37 however a diverging interpretation.

<sup>159</sup> defined in 104

may be divided into three groups <sup>154</sup> 1 they observe the sastra, being positive in their decision that the above doctrine is the true meaning of the sastra, 2 they believe that it is the true meaning, without however acting upon it, 3 they do not protest that it cannot possibly be the true meaning, without however believing that it is. All three groups will be released from the acts to which they have been in bondage since beginningless times. In other words, even if they do not act upon this meaning but still believe in it, and even if they do not believe in it but still do not deny it, they will be released from their evil because they do believe in it and do not deny it, for soon thereafter they will come to act upon this meaning and attain release. Those, however, who do not admit that it is true what God himself maintains, viz that He is the foundation of all ātmans because the ātman is God's body, that the ātman is a sesa of God and can be actuated by God alone and so performs all acts, and those who deny that it is true, are devoid of all knowledge, they are lost and destitute of reason for it is reason by which we have decisive knowledge of the exact nature of a substance <sup>155</sup> They, however, have no such knowledge and no inkling of the truth

32

10 *Why jñāna yoga is so difficult to practise*

33

Even if a man knows that the sastras teach that the proper form of the ātman is distinct from the prakṛti that it has the aforesaid nature and that one should always hold that this is the truth, still he keeps on living in and with the objects conformably to the ancient vasanā of his prakṛti. Why should this be so? Because the creatures being conjoined with prakṛti, will obey their beginningless vasana. And try as they may to restrain them from doing so what can the sastras do against creatures that obey their vasanā?

34

Desire and hatred are directed to the objects of the sensorial as well as of the motorial senses <sup>156</sup> for desire — which is brought about by the old vasanā — is an urgent longing to experience these objects and hatred appears when this experience is hindered. Desire and hatred are the factors which prevail over anyone who aspires to jñāna yoga and controls his senses, and they carry him back to their own effects. One

<sup>154</sup> that the persons summed up in st 31 constitute different categories R distils from *apī* ( and also ) in *te pī*

<sup>155</sup> *cetahkārjyam hi astu jñāna ātmanis ca jñāna* lit

is an effect of the cetah

<sup>156</sup> locomotion prehension speech digestion, procreation (see Sinha p 10, YID 4 p 38)

and excessive bhakti No one else but God could know it or teach it, for it is the greatest mystery of the Vedānta

N B *Incidental discussion of God's avatāra*

**Question** - But did not God's birth take place a short time ago? It is contemporary with Arjuna's, whereas Vivasvant lived 28 mahāyugas ago So how should God be understood when He says that He has taught this yoga to Vivasvant at the beginning of the age? It is well known to Arjuna<sup>163</sup> that Kṛṣṇa is the Supreme Person and that it therefore is quite possible that He has taught Vivasvant, so his question can only mean 1 is God's birth illusory — God being not subjected to karman-<sup>164</sup> or is it real, 2 if it is real, then how has God been born in a bodily shape, with what ātman, and why, 3 when has God been born, and 4 to what end?

**Answer** 1 God's birth is real, for God says explicitly that his births in the past have been numerous and He compares his own birth with Arjuna's "My birth, like yours"

2 God comes into being by his own will<sup>165</sup> and in his proper form,<sup>166</sup> without giving up any of the modes of his absolute supernal manifestation<sup>167</sup> but retaining his own nature<sup>168</sup>

3 There is no fixed time for the birth of God, whenever the dharma, which is taught by the Vedas and should be observed according to the Vedic precepts for each station and stage of life, is declining and the adharma, the opposite of dharma, is on the increase, God creates himself in this manner by his own will

4 Whenever God observes that the leading Vaisnavas who follow

<sup>163</sup> R refers to G 10, 12 13 and MBh 238,23 where Arjuna heard from Bhīṣma *Kṛṣṇa eva tu lokānām utpattiḥprabhavāpīyayaḥ | Kṛṣṇasya te kṛte bhūtaṁ idaṁ viśvaṁ carācaram, Kṛṣṇasya kṛte* is explained as *Kṛṣṇasya śeṣabhaṭam jagat*

<sup>164</sup> as the origination of every being is due to karman it might be thought that the birth of God who is not subjected to karman is illusory

<sup>165</sup> *ātmamāyayā* G = II *ātmajñānena* cf Ch III p 13 f

<sup>166</sup> To corroborate this R quotes ÇvetUp 38 TaittS 22.125, ChUp 16.6, TaittĀr 16.1 TaittNarUp 118 ChUp 3.142 BĀU 4.36 TaittĀr 3.13.1 God makes his proper form assume the generic structure (*samsthāna*) of the class (of gods men etc *jāti*) in which He wishes to be born

<sup>167</sup> R sc his being unborn, undying etc.

<sup>168</sup> *prakṛtiṁ* G = R *svabhāvam* compare Intr *s-asvabhāvam ajahad eva*, and ÇBh 1.31 (Th p 297) *devādīnām samāsrayantīyat-āya tattajjātīrāpasamsthānānugunakarmasamanvītaḥ svakīyaṁ svabhāvam ajahad eva śreecchayā bahudhā vyajyate parah puruṣaḥ* and also ÇBh 1.1,22 (Th. p 241), on *samsthāna*, see Sinha, pp 49 52 and 79-81

attempts jñānayoga — i.e. stops making his senses function — away from the ātman and toward the objects. Therefore, if a man is conjoint with prakṛti and consequently inclined to make his senses function, he should immediately when attempting to execute a means for release try to control his senses by means of karmayoga i.e. by making his senses function — and so put an end to desire which annuls the knowledge of the ātman as well as the knowledge that ātman and prakṛti are different.<sup>100</sup>

- 42 The senses are called an important impediment of knowledge as long as the senses keep operating in objects knowledge of the ātman cannot possibly be produced. A more important impediment is the manas as long as the manas is concerned with objects, there will be no knowledge of the ātman, even if the senses have been restrained. Still more important than the manas is the buddhi for even if the manas is turned away from the objects, there will still be no knowledge of the ātman as long as the buddhi is formed with a contrary decision. But even if all of them, senses, manas and buddhi, have ceased but desire does persist, then desire will again induce a person to operate in the objects and thereby prevent the knowledge of the ātman from originating. When one has come to know this desire, which is incompatible with knowledge and directed one's manas to karmayoga by means of the buddhi,<sup>101</sup> then one should put an end to this desire.
- 43

### D KARMAYOGA (continued)

#### 1 *Karmayoga is known of old*

- 4, 1—2 God has taught the yoga not only in this period but also in the beginning of this age<sup>102</sup> — then to Vivasvant —, as a means of attaining the release which is man's supreme end, and He has done so in order to save the world. The rājarsis of old knew this yoga in its succession from Vivasvant to Manu and from Manu to Ikṣvāku. But for a long time most of the yoga has been lost because of the stupidity of the people who heard it. This yoga — essentially the same as the ancient one — God has now explained at length to Arjuna with all that it involves, because Arjuna has resorted to God out of love.
- 3

<sup>100</sup> jñāna- 'knowledge of a single object', vijñāna 'discriminating knowledge, distills edge of difference between more objects (vi √jñā- "to know from")

<sup>101</sup> 'ātmānam manasā G = R manas buddhyā for the frequent equation of

<sup>102</sup> i.e. = manas-, see n. 280 and Ch. V, p. 36

YID 4 *sanvatsara-*



like — by sacrificing to them in accordance with the precepts of the śāstras, but nobody worships God himself, who is the ātman of those divinities and the enjoyer of all sacrifices,<sup>173</sup> by taking no interest in the results of their sacrifices. Why not? Because in all worlds<sup>174</sup> the act is soon followed by its result e.g. son, cattle etc., heaven etc. Because the unending evil piled up in beginningless times has not been annulled, all those worldly people lack discernment, therefore they want rapid results from their acts and perform for the sake of a son, cattle, heaven etc. all various acts by which homage is paid not to God, but to the divinities. Nobody feels sufficiently vexed with samsara to aspire to release and to practise the karmayoga, which is a propitiation of God, in order to attain release.

How then is the evil annulled? It is God who creates maintains 13 and dissolves<sup>175</sup> the entire universe which is organized with the system of the four stations and divided by the three gunas and by the acts corresponding to the gunas. However, although God is creator He is not agent. How is that possible? Because 1 his acts — variform crea 14 tion etc. — do not bind him, i.e. the variety in creation, which is caused by the existence of variform beings, gods, men etc. is not brought about by God, but by variform karman, good and evil so, by discriminating between both facts, viz. that not God but karman brings about the variety in creation, it is proved that God is not agent, 2 only the ksetrajñas, who have received body and organs at the time of creation, all experience the objects — likewise created — in accordance with their karman, and they do so because they desire the results of their acts, experiences etc. It is these ksetrajñas who desire the results of the act of creation, not God<sup>176</sup>. God is only the efficient cause of the creation of the creatures, gods, men etc., whereas the powers of the various kinds of karman of the ksetrajñas — who are creatures — constitute the material cause of the variety of gods, men etc. in creation. So, in order to exist in a variety of forms, the ksetrajñas require God only as the author of creation,<sup>177</sup> all the rest is their own doing, for it is the innate power of their previous karman which causes them to be the substances, god, man etc., which they are<sup>178</sup>. Now, a person who

<sup>173</sup> cf. G 9.24 *aham hi sarvayajñānām bhoktā*

<sup>174</sup> R G *mānuṣe loke* implies all worlds (of prakṛti)

<sup>175</sup> R G *mayā sṛṣṭam* implies *mayā rakṣate* and *upasamhṛīyate*

<sup>176</sup> R quotes VS 2.1.34 and VP 14.51-52 see my remarks Ch III p 15

<sup>177</sup> paraphrasis of VP 14.51, operant cause *nimittakarana*, material cause *pradhanakarana* cf. Srinivasachari Finite Self, p 37

<sup>178</sup> paraphrasis of VP 14.52.

the dharma<sup>169</sup> try to resort to God but cannot achieve their end because God's name, acts and being are inaccessible to speech and thought, that they do not perceive him and therefore cannot sustain their ātman to attain beatitude, and that they consequently have a thousand misconceptions in a moment's time, then God comes into being in that particular age so that He may rescue them by allowing them to behold his proper form and acts and to listen to his words and that He may destroy the unrighteous and restore the declining Vedic dharma — which constitutes a propitiation of God — by revealing to them his proper form most worthy of propitiation

- 9 When a man knows God's birth and acts to be truly God's — i.e. that they are essentially God's and not the prakṛti's, that they serve only to rescue the righteous and lead them to God, and that they are of God whose birth is not a common natural conjunction of the ātman with the evil prakṛti and guṇas in which karman is rooted, but who possesses all beautiful qualities —, then he will suffer no more births himself. On the contrary, he will attain God after all his sins, which prevent him from attaining God, have been washed away by his true knowledge of God's birth and acts and after he has resorted to God in his present life in the manner which God has explained, loving God alone and concentrating on God alone

- 10 Many, in fact, have been purified in this manner by their exact  
11 knowledge<sup>170</sup> of God's births and acts<sup>171</sup>. However, God does not only rescue those who resort to him in the shape of one of his avatāras, by descending into that shape alone, but He reveals himself to all who resort to him, whatever the shape in which they represent him. In fine, all people who wish to follow God alone do follow God's nature — however inaccessible it be to their speech and thought — by having perfect evidence of him in all shapes<sup>172</sup> in which they may represent him

## 2 The rarity of karmayogins

- 12 Still, but a few do actually follow God, for everyone who desires direct results from his acts worships the divinities — Indra and the

<sup>169</sup> = G *sādhu* read *uktalakṣanadharmasīlā*

<sup>170</sup> = G *jñānatāpasā*

<sup>171</sup> R cites Taittār 3.13.2 *tasya dhīrā parijñānanti yonim*, G *yonī* meaning here 'the manner in which He has been born'. For definitions of *rāga*, *bhaya*- and *krodha* see n 104

<sup>172</sup> = G *svaśāśa*

#### 4 *Karmayoga implies knowledge*

■ *The knowledge implied is the knowledge that the ātman is distinct from prakṛti*

Karmayoga has the form of knowledge because it involves the knowledge that the ātman is distinct from the body<sup>184</sup> When a man perceives that acts, when they are performed, have the form of knowledge because they are realizations what the ātman really is, and when he perceives that this knowledge has the form of action because it is implied in action, then he knows the purpose of the sāstras and is capable of release, for by every act which he performs he seeks to realize this purpose of the sastras

#### b *Proof*

*Question* How is it evidently proved that acts, when they are performed have the form of knowledge?

*Answer* It is proved by the fact that, if an aspirant performs his acts without interest in the results and without the misconception that the ātman is identical with prakṛti and guṇas, it is said by people who know the truth<sup>185</sup> that this aspirant is a sage whose previous karman has been annulled by the essential knowledge which is implied in his acts By virtue of their knowledge of the truth it is an established fact that acts have the form of knowledge, for if a man renounces his personal interest in the results of his acts and is entirely satisfied by his own eternal ātman and if he in that spirit, performs his acts without directing his buddhi to the non eternal prakṛti then he does not really act, even though he be actively engaged in acting, in other words, he practises knowledge in the disguise of action If a man has his citta and manas under control and is not possessive with regard to a common thing of the prakṛti because he has only the ātman in mind, and if he, then, performs purely bodily acts without aiming at their results, he will not fall a prey to saṃsāra,<sup>186</sup> in other words, he contemplates the ātman by such acts, that is by mere karmayoga without intercession of jñānayoga When a man is perfectly contented with the things which happen to be at hand for the sustenance of his body, when he endures the pairs of opposites — cold heat etc — while he is executing the means of release, then he is exempt from all envy, for he realizes

<sup>184</sup> see R.'s definition of karmayoga ad 2,39

<sup>185</sup> read *-dogdhaśraṇīnakarmānām budhās tattvajñā āhuh*

<sup>186</sup> *kilbiṣam G = R saṃsāram*

- knows that God, though being agent of creation, is still non-agent and that God has no interest in the results of his acts of creation etc., will no longer be tied by his previous acts which are performed for the sake of their results and therefore prevent his undertaking karmayoga and cause him to have interest in results; in other words, he will be released. Having purified themselves by means of this same knowledge about God, the aspirants of old performed their acts; in the same manner one should purify oneself by means of the said knowledge of God and perform the acts which previously have been performed by those aspirants<sup>179</sup> whom God had taught yoga. God now proceeds to discuss the form of these acts.

### 3. *It is difficult to know these acts.*

- 16 The aforementioned aspirants, although they did have some knowledge, did not know the proper form of the acts which should be performed<sup>180</sup> and the proper form of the knowledge which these acts imply.<sup>181</sup> God will explain this now. If one knows and observes it, one will be released from the bondage of samsāra.
- 17 Why is it so hard to know? Because 1. one should know exactly what constitutes an act that is a means of release; 2. one should know the periodical, occasional and desiderative acts which are naturally variform because they involve the acquisition of things required for their performance; 3. one should know what the knowledge itself is.<sup>182</sup> It is difficult for an aspirant to come to know the way of karman, i.e. to realize that the śāstras aim at only one result with all the acts which they prescribe, viz. the resulting release,<sup>183</sup> and to realize, when one has come to know which are the acts, that one should renounce the variety resulting from the variety of the results of periodical, occasional and desiderative acts, of the acquisition of the various means required for their performance etc.

<sup>179</sup> R.: viz. Vivasvant, Manu and Ikṣvāku of 4.1.

<sup>180</sup> = G. karma.

<sup>181</sup> G. akarma in the sense of jñāna-, this meaning parallel with that of naiṣkarmya- which was taken to mean jñānayoga (3,3) and akorman- "id." (3,8); further on (st. 4,18 ff.; 6,1-2) R. will explain that jñānayoga merges into karmayoga; this jñāna- is kartur ātmano yāthātmyajñāna- "true knowledge about the agency of the ātman", discussed 5,8-9.

<sup>182</sup> resp. G. 1. karman-, 2. vikarman- (vi- expressing variety), and 3. akarman- (= jñāna-, see above n. 181).

<sup>183</sup> R. refers to G. 2,41.

task; of the threefold <sup>192</sup> controlling of the breath; and of the restricting 29—  
of meals. Those who perform karmayoga while sustaining their body 31  
by means of sacrificial remainders will go to the eternal Brahman.<sup>193</sup>  
But he who does not devote himself to periodical, occasional and desi-  
derative acts — mahāyajñas etc. — will not be able to achieve man's  
worldly ends <sup>194</sup> — dharma, artha and kāma —, let alone man's supreme  
end, release.

So there are many ways of practising karmayoga and all of them 32  
lead to true knowledge of the ātman.<sup>195</sup> All of them result from perio-  
dical and occasional acts which are being performed day by day. When  
one knows and observes this, then one will be released.

#### 6. Importance of the component of knowledge in karmayoga.

An act has two forms, knowledge and substance; of these two the 33  
component of knowledge is more than that of substance, because an  
act with all its accessories is perfected in knowledge. This knowledge,  
which is obtainable by all various means, can be practised by activity.  
If that is done, then this knowledge will in due time reach the stage 34  
where it is within the grasp of the active person. When a man devotes  
himself to the acts which are set forth by God,<sup>196</sup> then he should by  
prostration, questioning and attendance invite those sages who have  
immediate presentation of the proper form of the ātman to teach him  
so that he may acquire their knowledge; when these sages are honoured  
by his prostration etc. and observe his mental disposition by the questions  
which he puts to them in his desire for knowledge, they will teach  
him this knowledge.

#### 7. The immediate presentation of the proper form of the ātman.

This immediate presentation <sup>197</sup> is the knowledge which will keep 35  
the person who possesses it safe from perplexity, i.e. from the mis-  
conception that the ātman is the body, this perplexity being the seat

<sup>192</sup> sc. *pāraka*-, *recaka*- and *kumbhaka*-.

<sup>193</sup> obviously in the sense of ātman, as in st. 32.

<sup>194</sup> expl. of G. *lokaḥ*.

<sup>195</sup> *vitatā brahmaṇo mukhe* G. = R. *ātmayāthātmyavāptisādhanaṭaya sthitāḥ*;  
for this sense of *mukha*- cf. the expression *-mukhena* "by means of".

<sup>196</sup> R.; G. 2,17-39 where the *sāṃkhye buddhiḥ* was discussed.

<sup>197</sup> *sakṣātkāra*-; on this term see ÇBh. 1,1,1, p. 10 (Th. p. 16); YID. 2, p. 6,

and Lacombe, ASV. 349-350 "le disciple écoute (*śravaṇa*-) docilement et avec  
foi la leçon du maître, réfléchit (*manana*-) sur son contenu,.... puis sa  
méditation (*nididhyāsana*-) se concentre, se simplifie, devient de plus en plus  
intuitive; à la limite ce sera l'intuition pure (*sakṣātkāra*-) de l'essentielle vérité".

- that his own acts alone are the cause of the adversity effected by others; and when he looks at the success and the failure of his acts with equanimity, then, however active he may be, he is not of the
- 23 saṃsāra. When ■ man is interested in nothing but the ātman and consequently is detached from all possessions and lives to perform acts of sacrifice etc. as discussed above, then he will be completely released from his previous 'karman which is the cause of his bondage.

c. *Acts imply the realization that they consist of God.*

- 24 The entire act consists of Brahman because it is of Brahman's nature: the sacrifice is Brahman,<sup>187</sup> the utensils are Brahman, the fire in which the sacrifice is offered is Brahman, and the sacrificer himself in Brahman. He, who contemplates this insight, contemplates the act-as-Brahman. Such a one is capable of knowing the proper form of the ātman — which is Brahman — through his acts, because his acts are of Brahman's nature. In other words, the acts performed by an aspirant have the form of knowledge because they imply the realization that they consist of Brahman and are therefore themselves a means of contemplating the ātman without the intercession of jñānayoga.<sup>188</sup>

### 5. *Different kinds of karmayoga.*

- 25 There are several kinds of karmayoga: karmayoga may take the form of sacrifices by which the gods are worshipped;<sup>189</sup> or of the
- 26 sacrifice which is Brahman; or of controlling the senses; of frustrating
- 27 the manas'<sup>190</sup> inclination to the activities of senses and prāṇas; karma-
- 28 yoga may take the form of worship of gods at the expense of honestly acquired means; of the practice of charity; of yāgas and homas; of devotion to austerities; of pilgrimages to tirthas and holy places;<sup>191</sup> of the task of Vedic study; of the knowledge of the object of that

<sup>187</sup> R.: *brahmārpaṇam* is adjectival to *haviḥ*: "the sacrifice, the utensils of which are Brahman"; "an *arpana*- is that with which a sacrifice is offered, viz. a spoon etc."

<sup>188</sup> this passage is not clear; on the one hand *brahman*- is equated with the Supreme Person (*karmanah parābrahmabhūtaparamapurūṣātmakatva...*), on the other with the ātman (*brahmabhūtam ātmasvarūpam*); moreover the realization that the acts "consist of" God is called a "means of directly contemplating the ātman"; it seems that R. interprets *br.* = Supreme Person in 24 a, b & d, and = ātman in 24 c; only if so twisted the passage makes some sense.

<sup>189</sup> = G. *daivam yajñam*.

<sup>190</sup> *ātma*- G. = R. *manah*-.

<sup>191</sup> this sense is given to *yoga*- in G. *yogayajñās* to distinguish it from *karmayoga*- of which it is a subspecies.

aim that has been set forth, will no longer be tied to saṃsāra by the 42  
 endless acts of old which cause his bondage. Therefore, dispel the  
 doubts of the ātman, which result from beginningless ignorance, by  
 means of the knowledge of the ātman present in your own heart, the  
 knowledge which you have been taught by God, and undertake the yoga  
 which you have been taught by God and engage yourself in work!

### E KARMAYOGA (continued)

1. *Karmayoga is to be preferred to jñānayoga as a means of attaining the ātman.*

*Question* God praises on the one hand jñānayoga<sup>204</sup> and on the other 5, 1  
 hand karmayoga, for in Lecture Two it has been demonstrated that an  
 aspirant to release should first practise karmayoga and afterwards,  
 when his internal organ has been purified, practise jñānayoga<sup>205</sup>. On  
 the other hand it has been said in Lectures Three and Four<sup>206</sup> that  
 even with regard to a person who is qualified for jñānayoga karmayoga  
 is superior to jñānayoga as a means of attaining the ātman. Now, which  
 one of the two, karmayoga or jñānayoga, is really the better means of  
 attaining the ātman, i.e., which one is more easily practicable and more  
 rapidly efficacious?<sup>207</sup>

*Answer.* Both karmayoga and jñānayoga are even for a person 2  
 entitled to practise jñānayoga equally autonomous means of attaining  
 beatitude. But karmayoga is better than jñānayoga. Why? Because a 3  
 karmayogin who, being completely satisfied by the cognition of the  
 ātman implied in karmayoga,<sup>208</sup> does not desire anything different from  
 the ātman and consequently does not hate anything, and who resignedly  
 endures the pairs of opposites, has for ever taken a firm stand in  
 knowledge<sup>209</sup>. Such a one will find no difficulty in loosening his bonds,  
 for he is firmly fixed on karmayoga which is easy to practise. If one 4  
 were to teach that karmayoga and jñānayoga<sup>210</sup> have different results  
 in that karmayoga only results in jñānayoga and that jñānayoga alone

<sup>204</sup> saṃnyāsasam karmāṇām G = R. jñānayogam.

<sup>205</sup> see ad 2,53

<sup>206</sup> resp 3,4-8 and 4,16-24

<sup>207</sup> saukaryāc cāighrjāc ca, terms adopted from GAS 9

<sup>208</sup> see G 4, 18-23

<sup>209</sup> nityasamnyāsī G = R. nityajñānanisṭhah, saṃnyāsa in the sense of  
 'knowledge' (cf akarma in G 4 17, n 181), derived from the equation saṃnyāsa-  
 = jñānayoga- (n. 204), in 61 it will be said that karmayoga implies jñāna-  
 but the latter not the former

<sup>210</sup> = G jñānāyoga- 'knowledge of the ātman' (cf supra ad 2, 39, n. 77)

of all attitudes caused by that misconception, such as possessiveness and the like. By this knowledge one will perceive in one's own ātman the beings which one knows to exist in a plurality of forms. Then one perceives that all beings exist totally in God, for the ātman is equal to God's being when it is exempt from name-and-form: all ātmans, if  
 36 free from prakṛti, are equal to one another<sup>198</sup> and to God.<sup>199</sup> Even if  
 37 a man is the worst of sinners, he will in virtue of this knowledge of  
 the ātman lose the wickedness which was peculiar to him before. The  
 knowledge of the proper form of the ātman annuls the previous acts  
 which adhere to the ātman and have been piled up since beginningless  
 38 times. Nothing in the world purifies more than this knowledge; there-  
 fore it annuls all evil. He who has reached perfection by practising  
 karmayoga daily in its form of knowledge in the above manner, will in  
 due time and of his own accord find this knowledge about his own  
 39 ātman.<sup>200</sup> He who believes that the said knowledge will increase, who  
 has focused his mind thereupon and who restrains his senses and keeps  
 them away from all other objects, will soon reach the aforesaid stage  
 of maturity and acquire that knowledge; soon thereafter he will attain  
 the supreme nirvāṇa.<sup>201</sup>

40 When a man does not acquire this knowledge by having it taught  
 him, when he does not strive to increase this knowledge if it is taught  
 him, and when he is doubtful of this knowledge, then he will perish.  
 When this knowledge is doubted, then neither the worldly ends of  
 man<sup>202</sup> — dharma, artha and kāma —, nor man's supreme end —  
 release — can be achieved, because all ends of man can only be achieved  
 through the acts which are prescribed by the śāstras and because the  
 achievement of ends through acts presupposes the presence of the  
 decisive knowledge that the ātman is different from the body. There-  
 41 fore, he who doubts this knowledge will find no happiness at all. That  
 man, however, whose acts do have the form of knowledge, whose doubts  
 of the ātman are dispelled, in the manner that has been explained, by  
 the knowledge of the ātman, and whose mind<sup>203</sup> is focused on the

<sup>198</sup> R. refers to G. 5,19 *nirdoṣaṃ hi saṃaṃ brahma* (= the totality of the ātmans).

<sup>199</sup> R. refers to G. 14,2 and MuṇḍUp. 3,1,3; the ātman is equal to God in so far as it is separated from prakṛti.

<sup>200</sup> V.: *atrātmanā viśayasaptamī*.

<sup>201</sup> *śāntiḥ* G. = R. *nirvāṇam* (cf. G. 6,15), *nirvāṇa-* being the effect of *śānti-* (cf. 2,71-72); *nirvāṇa-* should be taken in the sense of 2,72 (see n. 111): *sukhaikatānam ātmānam*.

<sup>202</sup> as supra st. 31.

<sup>203</sup> *ātmanāntam* G. = R. *manasīnam*.



- results in the contemplation of the ātman, then one's knowledge would be incomplete. Both in fact have one and the same result, for both result in the contemplation of the atman and are, therefore, optional<sup>211</sup>
- Still, there is no jñānayoga without karmayoga. When a person, who is accustomed to reflect on the atman,<sup>212</sup> practises karmayoga, he will have no difficulty in completing the karmayoga and he will soon reach the ātman<sup>213</sup> of his own accord, whereas a person who practises jñānayoga will find it very difficult to complete his jñānayoga and therefore he will reach the ātman only after a long time. When a man practises karmayoga his manas<sup>214</sup> will be purified because the acts prescribed by the śāstras to which he devotes himself are propitiations of God and therefore pure in themselves. He will meet no difficulty in controlling his manas as his manas is concomitant with the acts which he performs<sup>215</sup> consequently he will subdue his senses. His atman is the atman of all beings because his devoted practice implies the realization that the atman is essentially non agent<sup>216</sup>. Such a one, active though he be, will not be tied by the misconception that the ātman is prakṛti and therefore he will soon attain the atman. Hence it is clear that karmayoga is superior to jñānayoga because it is more easily practicable and more rapidly efficacious.

## 2 The realization that the ātman is non agent

- 8—9 He who, in virtue of his true knowledge of the atman,<sup>217</sup> avows that the sensorial and motorial senses and the pranas operate in their own objects will thereby know that he himself does not do anything, in other words, he knows that this agency is effected by the natural conjunction of his proper form with senses and pranas rooted in karman and does not result from the proper form of his ātman<sup>218</sup> whose proper
- 10 being is knowledge and nothing else. If a person has in this manner

hence jñānayoga (st 4) hence jñānayogin (st 5 cf n 118)

<sup>211</sup> expl of G *ekam*

<sup>212</sup> = G *muniḥ* see supra n 103

<sup>213</sup> = G *brahman* cf my remarks in Ch V

<sup>214</sup> *śuddhātmā* and *vijñātā* G = R -*mama*

<sup>215</sup> cf n 122

<sup>216</sup> *kartṛ ātmano jñātṛmyānusandhānamīṣṭhatayā* "because he is firmly fixed on the true realization regarding the agency of the ātman (same expression supra ad 4 16 n 181) R because of this knowledge (sc that the atman being not agent stands in no relation to prakṛti) all atmans are equal differences being brought about by prakṛti R refers to G 5 19

<sup>217</sup> *tattvaṁ G = M ātmatattvaṁ* 'who knows the ātman to be an entity of its own kind

<sup>218</sup> in the text *mama* stands for *ātmanah*

3. experiences which the different agents have of the results of their acts.

*Question.* Then what brings about agency, acts and the experiencing of results?

*Answer.* The *vāsanā* of the *prakṛti* <sup>222</sup> which is an effect of the misconception that gods etc. constitute the *ātman*; this misconception itself is an effect of the *ātman*'s conjunction with the forms of gods etc. and this conjunction is an effect of ever previous *karman* that has been brought about in beginningless times.

15 Therefore the *ātman* does not take away the sufferings of a being — a son etc. — which is dear to the *ātman* because the *ātman* is related to it; nor does the *ātman* take away the happiness of a being because that being is odious to the *ātman*; <sup>223</sup> for the *ātman* does not have a body that has anything in common with any body of gods etc., <sup>224</sup> so that the *ātman* is neither related to anyone nor vexed with anyone. All this is the effect of *vāsanā*.

*Question.* But how then is it possible that such a *vāsanā*, which is contrary to one's proper nature, originates at all?

*Answer.* Because a person's knowledge is entirely concealed by his previous *karman* which serves to qualify that person to experience the results of his acts; this previous *karman* is incompatible with knowledge. While concealing this knowledge that *karman* produces the *ātman*'s conjunction with a body and produces at the same time the misconception that the *ātman* is this body. This misconception produces its own *vāsanā* as well as that of the acts corresponding to this misconception. From this *vāsanā* again arise the misconception that the *ātman* is *prakṛti*, and all kinds of activity which are rooted in this misconception.

4. Ignorance sublated by knowledge. <sup>225</sup>

16 When however this ignorance, this accumulation of beginningless and endless acts, which conceals the knowledge of the *ātman*, is sublated by the knowledge of the *ātman* produced by the teaching of the truth about the *ātman*, and when this powerfully purifying knowledge is enriched by daily practice, then this natural supreme, restrictionless and limitless knowledge reveals to the *ātman*s <sup>226</sup> everything as it is,

<sup>222</sup> *svabhāvaḥ* G. = R. *prakṛtīvāsanā*.

<sup>223</sup> read *karyacit pratikūlatayānabhimatasya*.

<sup>224</sup> expl. of G. = *ibhu*.

<sup>225</sup> R. connects this with G. 4,36-37.

<sup>226</sup> from the plural *teṣāṃ* (sc. *ātmanāṃ*) R. derives a further proof of the

just like the sun The express mention in the text of the distinct individuality of atmans which exist in a plurality, side by side with the word knowledge, proves that this knowledge is an essential quality of the ātman <sup>227</sup> The illustrative comparison just like the sun makes clear that the relation knower knowledge is as that of luminosity luminary <sup>228</sup> So it is an established truth that at the stage of samsāra the knowledge is restricted by acts, and that at the stage of release this knowledge shines in its fullest measure Therefore, when one has formed such positive decision <sup>229</sup> to contemplate the atman, when one has fixed his mind upon it and when one practises this knowledge in preference to anything else because it is one's highest object, then the old impurities will be washed away by the knowledge which is practised in this way and one will attain the ātman in that pure form from which one will never more return to samsāra the ātman in its essential form

### 5 The equality of the ātmans

He who knows the proper form of the atman <sup>230</sup> will see that same form in the atmans of all other creatures — however dissimilar these creatures may appear —, because all atmans have only one form, knowledge Inequality is of the prakṛti, not of the atman Consequently one will perceive that the atmans are the same in all creatures, because all have the same form, knowledge Now, at the stage where the means of release are executed, <sup>231</sup> i.e. in samsāra, an aspirant will succeed when his manas is in the said manner focused on the equality of the ātmans All atmans are equal to one another, as long as the ātman-substance <sup>232</sup> is not conjoined with prakṛti In other words, a man is

existence of a plurality of atmans as declared in 2.12 (to which he refers), the fact that all ignorance has been sublated ( *ajñānam naśtam ātmanah*, st. 16 b) proves that this plurality cannot be effected by upādhis (thus against Yāgyavalki, for in enlightenment no upādhis can be left.

<sup>227</sup> the doctrine of *dharmaśāstrajñāna*, see Srinivasachari, VA., p. 17.24, Varadachari Theory of knowledge, p. 62.

<sup>228</sup> So curiously Āpte's text *jñātyajñānyoḥ prabhāprabhātor rūpavasthānam*, which would mean that the *jñāty-* is a dharma of *jñāna*! If *ādityarat* is to be connected with *jñānam* it should be explained by sun light (so V.), the relation knower knowledge would be as luminary luminosity (*prabhāvatprabhā*) which indeed is the case (cf. CBh 1.11, p. 41 (Th. p. 59)) the text could be restored *jñānājñātroḥ prabhāprabhātor*

<sup>229</sup> *tadbuddhayaḥ* G = R *tathā tad-ātmadarśana-jñātyavastu-jñā*, for *adhyatma-jñāna* characterizes *buddhi-* (cf. supra ad 2.41)

<sup>230</sup> paraphrasis of G *paṇḍitāḥ*

<sup>231</sup> = G *īhāvā* "here on earth, before re'case"

<sup>232</sup> *brahman-* G = R. *ātmanastu*

released when he realizes that the atmans are equal to one another because essentially they all have one and the same form, knowledge

- 20 **Question** What qualities should a karmayogin possess if he desires to reach that stage of matured development of his knowledge at which he may perceive that all atmans are equal?

**Answer** He learns to know the proper form of the atman<sup>233</sup> by the teachings of sages who know the ātman as an entity<sup>234</sup> He is diligent in practising that knowledge and throws off the delusion that the atman is the body He remains fixed on contemplating at his pleasure the atman as an eternal principle In consequence of all this he feels neither joy nor hatred when he experiences pleasant or unpleasant things of the prakṛti A person who in this manner turning away his manas from objects other than his atman finds his sole happiness in the atman within himself, will no longer practise prakṛti, for now his manas is qualified to practise brahman and he finds the everlasting bliss which is the experience of brahman or the atman<sup>235</sup>

- 22 It is not difficult to give up experiencing the prakṛti, for one will find that these experiences which result from the contacts of the senses with the objects, are ephemereal and productive of suffering he who knows what they are will not enjoy them When a man at the stage of samsara,<sup>236</sup> where the means to release are executed, is capable of conquering the violence, which is effected by desire and anger, by his longing for the experience of the atman, then he is capable of experiencing the atman,<sup>237</sup> as soon as he is released from his body he will attain the bliss of experiencing the atman<sup>238</sup> A yogin is brahman<sup>239</sup> and attains the blissful experience of the atman when he completely renounces the experiencing of the external objects, finds his sole happiness in experiencing the atman, is fixed totally on the atman, increases his happiness only by contemplating the atman and its qualities,<sup>240</sup> and restricts his knowledge to the atman alone Then, when he is released from the pairs of opposites, when he has subdued the manas and

<sup>233</sup> = G *brahmanā brahman- being ātmanastu*

<sup>234</sup> || *tattvavidāṁ* to be explained as *supra* || 217

<sup>235</sup> *brahman* G = R *sthīrānāpātmanāvalokanaprīṇanubhave*, where *sthīrānāpā* || adjectival to *anubhava* (cf || 220)

<sup>236</sup> = G *ihava* || 231

<sup>237</sup> = G *yuktah* < qualified for

<sup>238</sup> = G *sukhi*

<sup>239</sup> here and *infra* *brahman* is to be explained by 'atman' for a slightly, though not essentially different interpretation of *brahmanvāda* see ad 272

<sup>240</sup> these qualities being *mityatva jñānatva ānandatva akarmavaśyatva* etc. (V ad 63a)

focused it on the ātman, when he is interested in all that is salutary to all creatures in so far as they are ātmans,<sup>241</sup> and when he is absorbed in the contemplation of the ātman, then all his impurities which are incompatible with the attainment of the ātman will be washed away and he will attain the beatitude of brahman. When a man is possessed of all these qualities, he will find no difficulty in attaining brahman; those who are exempt from desire and anger, who are wont to exert themselves and who have subdued and conquered their manas, have the beatitude of brahman within their reach. 26

#### 6. *Yoga.*<sup>242</sup>

A man may be released, not only at the stage where the means for release have been brought to a successful end, but already at the stage where they are being executed — in saṃsāra —, viz. by practising Yoga: Having completely stopped the functioning of the external senses, sitting with his trunk straightened in a posture<sup>243</sup> proper to yoga, equalizing his inhalatory and exhalatory breath circulating in his nose, he lives contemplating the ātman. His senses, manas and buddhi are no longer capable of anything except operating at the contemplation of the ātman, and — his sole object being release — he has lost all desire, fear and anger. 27—28

To conclude, the karmayoga, which involves the obligation of performing periodical and occasional acts and which culminates in Yoga, is easy to practise: he who knows that God is the enjoyer of sacrifices and austerities, the supreme Lord of the worlds,<sup>244</sup> the friend of all beings, will meet no difficulty in practising karmayoga, for karmayoga is worship of God, and all beings worship their friends devotedly. 29

### III THE CONTEMPLATION OF THE ĀTMAN

#### 1. *Karmayoga leading directly to the contemplation of the ātman.*

A person who does not aim at the results of his acts but who regards the acts themselves as his sole aim because they are propitiations of 6, 1

<sup>241</sup> R.: ātmanas sarveṣāṃ bhūtānāṃ hiteṣu niratāḥ.

<sup>242</sup> R.: this is the end and apex of karmayoga; as such it is equivalent with *yoga*— in the sense of “contemplation of the ātman” (2,53); the *yoga* is further discussed in Lecture 6.

<sup>243</sup> or: on a seat (*āsana*—), cf. 6,11.

<sup>244</sup> R. refers to *ṢvetUp.* 6,7.

God and does not intend to gain anything by them, is firmly fixed on jñānayoga<sup>245</sup> as well as on karmayoga which are both means of the attaining yoga or the contemplation of the atman. But a person who is solely fixed on jñānayoga<sup>246</sup> is not fixed on the karmayoga as well, such a one is devoted exclusively to knowledge as his means of release, whereas a man who is devoted to activity has both activity and knowledge. Karmayoga, as defined above, also implies knowledge that which is called jñānayoga<sup>247</sup> by those who know the proper form of the atman is actually karmayoga. A man, who has not yet realized what the atman is, and therefore not freed himself from the misconception that the atman is prakṛti, cannot be<sup>248</sup> a karmayogin who practises one of the kinds of karmayoga which have been enumerated above.

- 3 By karmayoga alone one is able to succeed in yoga because in karmayoga one does not risk being negligent about it. When a man aspires to the contemplation, i.e. to release,<sup>249</sup> karmayoga will cause him to succeed, only when the contemplation of the atman has already been secured,<sup>250</sup> will jñānayoga, i.e. inactivity, cause him to succeed, or, in other words, a man must perform acts until he has attained release.
- 4 Now, when has a man attained yoga? When the yogin is no longer able to interest himself in the objects of prakṛti differing from the atman or in corresponding acts, because naturally he does not experience anything but the atman, for then all delusions have gone. When a man wishes to attain yoga, then he can only do so by practising karmayoga, for at that stage one is still unable *not* to experience the objects and therefore karmayoga is one's only resource, because karmayoga means
- 5 practising one's interest in objects. However, one should save oneself by disengaging one's mind from its interest in objects and not perish
- 6 by neglecting to do so. In the first case the manas<sup>251</sup> will be one's friend, in the latter it will be one's enemy and bring about the opposite of beatitude.

<sup>245</sup> *saṁnyāsi* G = R *jñānayogamūṣṭhah* cf. supra n. 204 and n. 209.

<sup>246</sup> R interprets G *niragnih* and *akṛyāh* as 'not undertaking karmayoga (which involves sacrificial acts 5.29) and therefore exclusively jñānayogin'.

<sup>247</sup> = G *saṁnyāsi*.

<sup>248</sup> R quotes G 4.19 to prove that all karmayogins have forsaken this misconception.

<sup>249</sup> *ārurukṣor muner yogam* G = R *ātmanāvalokanaṁ prāptum icchor mumukṣor*, this sense of *yoga* in G 2.53.

<sup>250</sup> *yogārūḍhasya* G = R *pratiṣṭhita-yogasya* (*yoga*- in the sense of n. 249).

<sup>251</sup> corresponds to G *ātman*- in stt. 4 and 5.

17 There is another way Intemperance is incompatible with yoga, but  
 18 if one is temperate, then yoga will untie one's bonds When the intent  
 citta is constantly and invariably fixed and when one has lost all desire  
 19 for any object, then one has attained yoga<sup>258</sup> The ātman is like a lamp  
 shining unflickeringly because it is sheltered so the ātman shines with  
 motionless knowledge because all other activities of the mind have  
 20 ceased In yoga the citta, in which all activities have ceased, rejoices  
 in incomparable felicity In yoga a man perceives the ātman with his  
 21 mind,<sup>259</sup> is satisfied with it and indifferent to all other objects In yoga  
 a man enjoys perfect bliss which is beyond all senses and only compre-  
 hensible by the buddhi of the ātman Once a man is in yoga he will  
 not be able to move from his condition<sup>260</sup> because while in yoga he  
 22 enjoys boundless bliss Once a man has attained yoga he does not wish  
 for anything else when he has awaked from yoga, and when one is  
 constantly in yoga, no grievous suffering can disturb one's equilibrium  
 23 This is the yoga which is called knowledge, the knowledge strictly  
 opposite to conjunction with suffering,<sup>261</sup> and this knowledge a man  
 must possess And to acquire it he must begin with this decision that  
 the yoga is such as described above and thereafter practise this yoga  
 with a happy cetā

### 3 *Desire and how to conquer it*

24 There are two kinds of desires 1 those resulting from contacts,  
 2 those resulting from wishes Of these two kinds only the latter can  
 be relinquished and that may be done in virtue of the realization that  
 they have nothing to do with yoga As to the former, desires resulting  
 from contacts, one may relinquish the joy or hatred which one feels with  
 25 respect to them When one has done so and then withdraws the totality  
 of the senses from all objects and gradually abstains from everything  
 that is not the ātman by virtue of the buddhi — the one concerned with  
 distinction<sup>262</sup> —, then one must submerge the manas entirely in the  
 26 ātman and think of nothing but the ātman And wherever the manas  
 — which does not remain constantly fixed on the ātman on account

<sup>258</sup> *yuktah* G = R *yogārādhah* in the above sense (n 250)

<sup>259</sup> *ātmamā* G = R *anāsā*

<sup>260</sup> *lallvataḥ* G = R *tadbhūtaḥ* 'on account of being yoge sthitah'

<sup>261</sup> R. *taṁ duḥkhasamīyogapratiyogam duḥkhasamīyogapratyānikakāram*  
 y. *dnām*.

<sup>262</sup> *dhyatigṛhītāya* G = R. *vitrka śayāya* (sc discrimination between ātman  
 and prakṛti), <dhyati- in the sense of dhāraṇā? But cf V *prakṛāntatadāśīthā-*  
*tvarāśya dhyateḥ*

of its volatile nature — swerves from the atman in search of objects to which it is propelled, there one must strenuously subdue the manas in the ātman, in order to attain incomparable bliss. The yogin whose manas is immovably fixed on the atman, whose impurities are thereby completely burned away, whose rajas guna is wholly annulled and who therefore exists in his own proper form,<sup>203</sup> will find perfect felicity which is the experience of the atman. Without difficulties he will enjoy the boundless bliss which is the experience of the ātman.

#### 4 Four degrees in perfectly developed yoga

- At the highest stage of development of yoga there are four degrees
- a The ātmans of all creatures are equal when their proper form is separated from prakṛti, for all of them have one and the same form, knowledge, inequality is of the prakṛti. This proves that a person, who has brought his ātman into yoga, will see similarity in all ātmans when separated from prakṛti,<sup>204</sup> he will see that his own atman is in all beings and that all beings are in his own atman, in other words he will see that his own atman has the same form as the ātmans of all other beings and contrariwise, so that he has seen all that is atman when he has seen one ātman.<sup>205</sup>
  - b A man, who has reached the highest stage of development and in the said manner views the equality of God and all atman when the latter exists in its proper form beyond good and evil, will view God in all ātmans and all atmans in God, in virtue of their mutual equality he will see by the one what is the other. That man indeed views the proper form of the ātman, and God will not vanish out of his sight, for God is equal to that form of the atman, nor will that man vanish out of the sight of God who views in him Himself, when in virtue of his equality to God he views his atman as the equal of God.
  - c At which stage will yoga develop into full maturity? When a yogin who views his ātman in all beings becomes one with them because all have the same form of unrestricted knowledge, and when he renounces the differences of the prakṛti and devotes himself steadfastly to God, then — whatever condition he is in, even at the moment of awaking

<sup>203</sup> *brahmabhūtam* G = R. *śaśvarūpeṇāśrahitam*, brahman- equated with ātman.

<sup>204</sup> *sarvatra* G = R. *prakṛtyukteṣu ātmanu*

<sup>205</sup> R. quotes in support G 6,33 (*śamyena*) and 5,19 (*samam*)



from yoga — he will always view his equality to God in his own ātmans and in all beings.<sup>200</sup>

- 32 d. He reaches the summit when he no longer perceives any difference between happiness and suffering of his own ātman and those of other ātmans inasmuch as his ātman and the ātmans of other beings are mutually comparable and as all ātmans are equal and have no relations.

### 5. *How to hold one's manas.*

- 33 *Question.* It has been said that yoga is: perceiving that all beings are equal: that ātman is equal to ātman because all ātmans have the same form, knowledge, and that the ātman is equal to God in so far as both are not subject to karman. But Arjuna does not see how it is possible that yoga can ever be permanent, considering the volatility of the
- 34 manas: for the manas is by nature too volatile to allow the puruṣa to fix it permanently on one point, even if that point be one among the objects at which the manas is incessantly operating, and so the manas vehemently carries the puruṣa off. Therefore Arjuna thinks that it is not less difficult to hold the manas in order to concentrate it on the ātman — which moreover is the opposite of the objects at which the manas operates with so little concentration — than to hold a gale with a fan. So he asks God to tell him how the manas could be held.
- 35 *Answer.* In spite of the volatility of the manas, which indeed is undeniable, it is possible to hold the manas, viz. by fixing the manas on the ātman; this may be done by practising the knowledge of the qualities of the ātman and by taking an aversion to the objects
- 36 themselves by realizing their deficiency.<sup>207</sup> When a man does not control his manas,<sup>208</sup> then all his efforts to practise yoga will remain fruitless. A man however who has subdued his manas by practising karmayoga which is a propitiation of God and implies knowledge,<sup>209</sup> will be able to reach this yoga — which is the perceiving of equality — when he aspires to it.

<sup>200</sup> *mayi vartate* G. = R. *mām eva paśyati sātmani sarvabhūteṣu ca sarvada matsāmyam eva paśyati*; the ātman is equal to God in so far as it is not subject to karman even as God.

<sup>207</sup> paraphrasis of G. *abhyāsa-* and *vairāgya-* resp.

<sup>208</sup> *asaṁyatatāmanā* G. = R. *ajitamanasā*.

<sup>209</sup> *vaiśyātmanā... upāyatah* G. = R. *pūrvoktena madārādhana-rūpeṇāntar-gatājnānena karmāṇā jītamanasā*; from *upāya-* in the sense of "sādhana-".

## 6 The fate of a faithful but unsuccessful yogin

**Question**<sup>270</sup> : But what is the fate of a man who devotes himself faithfully to yoga but is unable to bring it to a successful end, because his efforts are too defective and the course of yoga is so severe, and who allows his manas to swerve? Will he not perish for failing in two respects,<sup>271</sup> like a cloud, torn from a large cloud, which cannot reach another cloud but perishes in between? On the one hand he is not devoted to a means of achieving a worldly end<sup>272</sup> — heaven etc —, on the other hand he loses his way to brahman. Now, God alone may solve this uncertainty, for God alone has always immediate evidential knowledge of everything<sup>273</sup>

**Answer** : A man who attempts yoga faithfully will perish neither here nor beyond, that is, neither by the frustration of his desires for the pleasures of prakṛti as well as for the experience of brahman, nor by falling back to his starting point which is a grievous suffering. On the contrary, a man who practises the incomparably auspicious yoga will never perish in present, past or future.

**Question** : Then what happens to him?

**Answer** : When he has reached the worlds which are allotted to those who have lived well, then the excellence of yoga — which is a means to knowledge — will allow him to enjoy in those worlds the good pleasures, desirous of which he swerved from yoga, and to enjoy them during timeless ages expiring with his desire for those pleasures. Then, when his desire has gone he will — in case he swerved from yoga at the very beginning — in virtue of that yoga be born in a family of pure and rich people who are qualified to start the course of yoga, in case he swerved at an advanced stage of yoga, he will be born in a family of yogins who practise<sup>274</sup> and teach yoga. Such a twofold birth<sup>275</sup> is rarely met with in the common world, and then only through

<sup>270</sup> R. Arjuna puts this question in order to hear exactly how powerful karmayoga is (referring to G. 2.40) — this power or excellence (*māhātmya*) being derived from the implied knowledge of the atman as well as from the Yoga in which it culminates (5.27-29) — and how powerful this Yoga itself is.

<sup>271</sup> viz. in the attaining of the *puruṣārthas* (dharma artha and kama) and that of the paramapuruṣārtha mokṣa.

<sup>272</sup> so R. explains G. *apratisthitaḥ*.

<sup>273</sup> *trāḍaṇyaḥ* G. = R. *svataḥ pratyakṣeṇa yugapat sarvaṃ sarvadā svata eva paśyatas t. vāto 'nyah*.

<sup>274</sup> read *dhīmatāḥ* for *śrīmatāḥ* *dhīmatāḥ* G. = R. *yogam kurvātāḥ*.

<sup>275</sup> R. connects the singular *janma* with two kinds of birth described in st.

41 and 42.

43 yoga In that new existence he will find again that same stage of  
developments of yoga which he left in his previous life Like a man  
awakened from his sleep he will strive so strenuously that no impe-  
44 diments will prevent him from gaining his end The excellence of  
yoga naturally <sup>270</sup> sends a man who has practised yoga in a former life,  
back to yoga willy nilly In case a man swerved with his manas before  
he had acquired knowledge of yoga but was desirous of knowing it,  
he will receive again his desire Consequently practising karmayoga  
he will rise beyond prakṛti <sup>271</sup> and, being released from his bonds,  
45 attain the atman which solely comprises knowledge and beatitude It  
is through knowledge that a man is born in a perfect condition, devoid  
of all impurities of good karman accumulated in beginningless times,  
and that he, though having swerved before, attains the highest end  
46 if he strives after it with all his effort<sup>a</sup> The yogin, being firmly fixed  
on an aim of man that is superior to all man's ends, is superior to  
those who aspire to man's ends by means of austerities or of any  
knowledge other than that of the atman, or by means of ritual cere-  
monies Therefore one should be such a yogin

47 Here ends the explanation of the Contemplation of the individual  
atman which is propaedeutic to the Paraśrīya and which has been  
taught by Prajapati <sup>272</sup> Now the Paraśrīya, or the knowledge of  
the Most High, is praised It is said that superior to the yogins of  
all kinds <sup>273</sup> is that yogin of whom God will now proceed to speak  
Compared to this yogin all yogins who resort to austerities etc are  
as inferior as mustardseeds compared to the Meru God considers  
that this superior yogin is he who has fixed his manas <sup>274</sup> on God  
because his excessive love of God adding something to his nature that  
others lack, he cannot find any support but God, who strives dili-  
gently <sup>275</sup> to attain God because his love is too ardent to allow him to  
be, if only for a single moment, separated from God and who worships  
God through bhakti

<sup>270</sup> "naturally = G hi, at which R remarks *prasiddham hy etad yogamā-  
hātmyam ity arthah*

<sup>271</sup> R's expl of G *sadbrahma* 'the Brahman capable of being called gods,  
men etc, hence prakṛti'

<sup>272</sup> cf n 113

<sup>273</sup> R takes *yoginām* in ablative sense *yogibhyaḥ yuktatamah* the best yogin  
of all for this *utām* (the bhakta) is not included in the four degrees of supra  
at 29.32 these are resumed in *yoginām*, whereas *sarveṣām* (separated from  
*yoginām* by *ap* and also ) refers to those (*tapasvīs* etc) summed up in n 46

<sup>274</sup> *antarātmā* G = R *manasā*, for the manas being the substratum of all  
various external and internal (sensoreal and mental) activities n "the soul of the  
interior" <sup>275</sup> G *śraddhā* thus explained

## PART TWO

### ON THE PROPER FORM OF THE SUPREME PERSON AND ON THE MANNER IN WHICH HE SHOULD BE WORSHIPPED BY BHAKTI

In Lectures 7-13 the proper form of the Supreme Person, who is the Supreme Brahman, and the manner in which He should be worshipped by bhakti are treated of. It appears from the Vedānta that the worship of God by bhakti is the means of attaining God. The śrutis teach that this bhakti is meditation or reverent concentration and that as such it is the effect of devout representation. Moreover, this reverent and loving meditation or bhakti<sup>282</sup> is as such very dear to man, because the object of bhakti, which is God himself, is very dear to him.<sup>283</sup>

<sup>282</sup> R. quotes ÇvetUp. 3,8 and TaittĀr. 3,12,7 where this worship by bhakti is called 'knowledge'; that this knowledge is synonymous with bhakti R. proves from TaittĀr. 3,12,7 *tām eva vidvān amṛta iha bhavati / nānṛgāḥ pañthā ajānāya vidyate*, combined with *nāham vedair na tapasā na dānena na cejyayā* (i.e. by no other way) śakya evaṁvidho draṣṭum drṣṭavān asi mān yathā // bhaktyā tv ananyayā śakya aham... *jñātum* (G. 11,53-53). Cf. ÇBh. 1,1,1 p. 8 ff. (Th. p. 13 ff.); further he quotes BĀU. 2,4,5; 1,4,5; ChUp. 7,26,2; MuṇḍUp. 2,2,8 where it is called 'meditation' (*dhyāna*-); according to R. these śrutis prove that bhakti is produced by representation (*smṛti*-, *dhyāna*- being equivalent with *smṛti*-: R. does not admit that self-concentration (*dhyāna*- in *yoga*-) is a source of knowledge); for the synonymity of *dhyāna*- with bhakti see n. 2.

<sup>283</sup> This R. proves from KathUp. 2,23 *nāyam ātmā pravacanena labhyo na medhayā na bahunā śrutena / yam evaiṣa vṛpate tena labhyas tasyaiṣa ātmā vivṛpate tanūm svām: pravacana-, medhā and śruta-* being sources of direct cognition (*anubhava*-) it follows that only a product of *smṛti*- can single out a devotee for election by the Supreme Ātman (so R. interprets *ātmān*-); that product of *smṛti*- is bhakti (cf. V. *sa ca varāṇyotāśhetuḥ sūdhya guṇa bhaktir eva*); the devotee's love for the object of bhakti (R. quotes *snehapāratam anudhyānam bhaktir ity ucyate budhaiḥ*) causes him to love bhakti itself.

# I THE TRUE KNOWLEDGE OF THE PROPER FORM OF THE SUPREME PERSON WHO IS THE OBJECT OF BHAKTI

## 1 Which kind of knowledge is meant here

- 7, 1 If, then, one has focused one's mind steadily on God and reposes<sup>284</sup> entirely on God because one loves God so dearly that one is unable to exist separated from his being, qualities, acts and dominion, by which knowledge then is one to aspire actively to the attainment of God and is one to know him completely and indubitably? This knowledge will now be explained together with the knowledge<sup>285</sup> of the manner in which God is distinguished from all spiritual and non-spiritual beings
- 2 Through this knowledge God will be known completely This knowledge is very rare Among the thousands of people qualified to observe the *śāstra*, no more than a few may aspire to *siddhi*, among the thousands who might aspire to *siddhi*, no more than a few may attain *siddhi*<sup>286</sup> by knowing God, among the thousands who might know God, no more than a few may know God as He really is In other words, there is actually no one who is capable of knowing God as He really is<sup>287</sup>

## 2 God's two prakṛtis

- 4 God has two prakṛtis, a lower and a higher one The lower one is the prakṛti of this world consisting of endless various objects, means and occasions of material experience and divided into eight categories, viz the five primordial elements and their qualities senses and mind,<sup>288</sup>
- 5 Mahat<sup>289</sup> and finally Ahamkāra God's higher prakṛti however, is not of the same order as this non spiritual prakṛti which solely consists of the objects experienced by the spiritual beings, but it is constituted by the spiritual beings themselves, the jīvas This is God's chief prakṛti, for the spiritual beings experience the lower, non spiritual material
- 6 prakṛti The higher, spiritual prakṛti supports the material one Now

<sup>284</sup> *āsraya*

<sup>285</sup> *jñāna* and *vijñāna*, *jñāna* is knowledge of a single object, *vijñāna*- (knowing from ) knowledge of the difference between more objects, cf supra 160

<sup>286</sup> R separates *śatātmam* and *siddhāntam*, taking *apī* in the sense of *ca*

<sup>287</sup> R quotes G 7.19.26

<sup>288</sup> G *manas*- is taken as the co ordinating organ of the senses and therefore indissolubly connected with them

<sup>289</sup> G *buddhi*- is taken in its Sāṃkhyan sense of *Mahat* to distinguish it from *buddhi*- as a mental attitude (supra G 2.41)

all beings composed of cit and acit, from Brahma to tuft of grass, whether existing in a superior or in an inferior condition, originate from these two prakrtis of God, and so they are of God. Therefore God is their origin and their dissolution, and He is their sesin.<sup>290</sup> And God is absolutely superior, not only because He is the cause of his two prakrtis which are themselves the causes of all things, and not only because He is the sesin even of the spiritual beings which are themselves the sesins of the non spiritual, but also because He possesses such qualities as knowledge, power, force etc.<sup>291</sup> All spiritual and non spiritual things, whether effects or causes, constitute God's body and depend on God who is their atman.<sup>292</sup> 7

### 3 God as prakarm

As has been already explained above, God, the Supreme Person, is modified by all existent beings and things which modify him by constituting the body of which He is the atman. From this point of view all words express God. So, by applying the grammatical rule of samānādhikaranya or functional co ordination,<sup>293</sup> God is said to be the quintessence of all entities. All these entities<sup>291</sup> with their peculiar individuality and characteristics have originated from God, are sesas of God and depend on God inasmuch as they constitute his body, and God himself is modified by all these entities of which He is the atman. These entities, which are of the nature of sattva, rajas and tamas and which exist in this world in the forms of body, senses, material objects and their causes, depend on God whose body they constitute. God himself, however, does not depend on them. The relation of God to his body is not the same as that of the individual atmans to their bodies. With the latter the bodies, though depending on the atmans, serve some purpose for the sustenance of the atmans within them. To God his 12

<sup>290</sup> R quote, SubalUp 2, VP 12,24 6438-39, BĀU 37 (M)

<sup>291</sup> in other words God is not only relatively (as the immanent God) but also absolutely (as the transcendent God) superior. the qualities are the *kalāṇagūṇas*, cf. supra n 4

<sup>292</sup> R quotes BĀU 37, 3 22 (M) and continues *ātmasarvabhāṇendrasvāhānam ca jagadbrahmanor prasiddham brahman-* is here as elsewhere (e.g. 8,3) taken as the collective ātmans. *ātmān* is the Supreme Ātman.

<sup>293</sup> defined by R (ÇBh 111, p 59, Th II 79) *pratyūstamistabhedanankārthaprititvam sāmānādhikaraṇam* co-ordination (of several terms) means the function of these terms to signify one object, there being a different purpose for the application of each different term. I may refer to Lacombe, Notes 242, ASV p. 107 f, Srinivāsachari, VA. pp. 38 f and 228 f

<sup>294</sup> enumerated in BhG 7,8-11

- 13 body serves no purpose at all, it serves to nothing but his sport <sup>295</sup> God is beyond all entities of sattva, rajas and tamas nature, because of his auspicious qualities which are peculiar to him and because these entities are modifications of him. But, although God is eternal and always forms a unity in himself, He is not known to the world constituted by gods, men, animals, immovables etc, for the world is perplexed by the entities consisting of gunas, however small and transient they may be, which are the material objects to be experienced by means of body and senses in accordance with previous karman

+ *This knowledge is obscured by God's māyā, but this māyā may be overcome through prapatti*

- 14 **Question** How is it possible that all kinds of experiencing beings come to think that the entities consisting of gunas, which are very inferior and transient, are fit objects of experience, while God himself exists who is boundlessly abundant bliss, who is eternal and always forms a unity in himself and who is superior to these entities which are only modifications of himself?

**Answer** The reason for this is God's māyā which consists of gunas and which, being created by the sporting God, <sup>296</sup> is difficult for anyone to know. This absolutely real māyā <sup>297</sup> causes the proper form of God to be obscured and one's own being to be thought of as the only fit object of experience. So being perplexed by God's māyā, <sup>298</sup> the whole world is ignorant of God whose real being is boundless bliss. Only those who resort to God relinquish māyā and worship him alone <sup>299</sup>

- 15 **Question** Why, then, does not everyone resort to God by prapatti as a first step to bhakti?

**Answer** Because those who are of evil karman do not resort to God

<sup>295</sup> on līlā cf. II 12

<sup>296</sup> dai. I G = R *devena kṛidāpravṛttena māyāna nirmitā*

<sup>297</sup> This against Ç who holds that māyā is neither real nor unreal. R takes māyā in the sense of miracle working instrument of power and compares it with the miraculous weapons of lore (quotes VP 11920), therefore the term cannot mean illusion. a māyāvin (illusionist) may suggest a certain notion (buddhi) to a person and that notion may have an illusory object but in itself it is real enough. This sense of miracle working or illusion creating influence holds always good the sense of māyā 'illusion' is secondary (aupacārika) like the cottages cry for the inhabitants of the cottages cry cf. ÇBh 111 p 102 (Th II 12c) and my remarks Ch III

<sup>298</sup> R recalls ÇetUp 4.19 māyām tu prakṛtiṃ vidvān (here m is to be taken in its secondary sense 'thing influenced by māyā') māyāmaṇi tu mahesṭaram

<sup>299</sup> māyām taranti BhG = R. māyām utsṛjya mām evopāsata

a *Four groups of people who do not resort to God*

These people may be divided into four groups which are more wicked successively <sup>300</sup>

- 1 Those <sup>301</sup> who have false knowledge who take interest in the objects of prakṛti, because they are ignorant of God's proper form,
- 2 those <sup>302</sup> who in the above way do know that it is the atman's sole essence to be a sesa of God, but think that likewise it is the sole essence of the material objects to be a sesa of themselves because though knowing that the atman is equal to God's proper form, they are not capable of longing for God,
- 3 those <sup>303</sup> whose knowledge of God and his dominion is nipped in the bud by deceitful reasonings which contend that such a knowledge is impossible,
- 4 the worst of all, those <sup>304</sup> who have positive knowledge of God and his dominion but hate God for it

b *Four groups of people who resort to God*

Those who are of good karman do resort to God and worship him 16 lovingly They too are divided into four groups each subsequent group being better than the preceding, as its prapatti is more distinguished in proportion to the over balance of their good karman

- 1 those <sup>305</sup> who have lost their foundation and their power and wish to get them back,
- 2 those <sup>306</sup> who aspire to power which they never possessed,
- 3 those <sup>307</sup> who aspire to acquire knowledge of the atman as an entity different from the prakṛti,
- 4 those <sup>308</sup> who know the proper form of the atman whose sole essence is to be a sesa of God <sup>309</sup> and do not stop at the mere knowledge of

<sup>300</sup> parallel with the *caturvidhāḥ sukṛtīṣaḥ* of BhG 7.16

<sup>301</sup> G *mādhāḥ*

<sup>302</sup> G *narādhamāḥ*

<sup>303</sup> G *māyāyāpahṛtājñānāḥ* māyā is given the sense of *kāṣṭhyukti* in keeping with his above demonstration 'suggestive sophisms'

<sup>304</sup> G *āsuraṇi bhāvam āśritaḥ*

<sup>305</sup> G *ārta*

<sup>306</sup> G *arthārthi* both *ārta-* and *arthārthi-* belong to the same category that of the aspirants to *aśtārjya-* (*aśtārjyārthinaḥ*)

<sup>307</sup> *jijṇāsu-* G = R *kantahārthiḥ* aspirant to knowledge of the *kevala* atman- R adds *jñānam evaśya śaraṇam ite jñānīḥ*, which V explains *jñānam ita buddhātmanubhava-śaraṇam*

<sup>308</sup> G *jñāni* aspirant to God

<sup>309</sup> R. cites BhG 7.5.



the ātman as an entity different from the prakṛti but wish to attain God himself, because they know that God alone is the highest aim to reach

6 *The jñānin is superior to the three others.*

- 17 Among these four the last mentioned the jñānin, is the foremost, for to him God is the only one to be reached and his union<sup>310</sup> with God is forever. The others are only united with God as long as they have not fulfilled their personal wishes. The jñānin is lovingly devoted<sup>311</sup> to God alone, whereas the others are devoted to their own ambitions as well as to God as the means of realizing them. Besides, the jñānin loves God so dearly that God himself cannot express how much he loves Him,<sup>312</sup> for his love is beyond quantity;<sup>313</sup> and God
- 18 loves the jñānin as dearly as the jñānin loves God. The others may be called friendly<sup>314</sup> in so far as they worship God, for he who accepts anything from God is of God who grants all. But the jñānin is regarded by God as Himself, that means, God considers the maintenance of his own ātman to depend on his worshipper's ātman, for such a one approaches God as his highest attainable end because without God he would not be able to maintain his ātman, therefore<sup>315</sup> God is not able to maintain His ātman without him and so he is His ātman<sup>316</sup>
- 19 This prapatti or resorting to God presupposes the knowledge that the ātman is essentially a śeṣa of God and therefore it does only appear after numerous auspicious births. Moreover, one will rarely meet a person in this world who after many virtuous lives has come to know that it is his sole essence to be a śeṣa of God<sup>317</sup> and that his own proper form, existence and activity depend on God who is the supreme One on account of his innumerable auspicious qualities,<sup>318</sup> and with this knowledge resorts to God in order to worship him, reflecting that for these reasons God alone is the highest attainable end and that God

<sup>310</sup> *śoga-*

<sup>311</sup> *bhakti*

<sup>312</sup> R *atyarthasabdo* (sc in G 7,17) '*nabhidhejavacanah*

<sup>313</sup> *śattārahita-*, R cites Prahlāda's love in VP 1,17 39 as an illustration

<sup>314</sup> G *udārah*, V remarks *jñānino 'tyarthapriyatatācanād anyeṣām apī kimcit priyatatā phalitam*

<sup>315</sup> V explains *saṁyogajñānam madabhīpṛāṇajñānam caṁdā vyaktam ity abhi-prāyaḥ*

<sup>316</sup> V regards this as a hyperbolic praise of the devotees of God

<sup>317</sup> R refers to G 7,5

<sup>318</sup> R refers to G 7,6cd-12

is everything which makes him resort to God and everything which he may wish for himself <sup>319</sup>

### 7 *The resorting to mere divinities*

All men in this world, who are constantly accompanied by the 20  
vāsana of their guna-determined condition,<sup>320</sup> allow their knowledge of  
God's being to be expelled by their desires which correspond with their  
vāsana and consist of gunas, and they resort to other divinities like  
Indra to have their desires materialized by means of certain obser-  
vances<sup>321</sup> meant to propitiate only these divinities, and they do not  
know God's proper form. But these divinities too constitute God's 21  
body, therefore, if out of ignorance<sup>322</sup> one wants to worship devoutly  
and faithfully such a one of God's bodies — Indra and the like —,  
then God will make one's faith unswerving and unhindered because in  
fact one has faith in a body of His although one does not know that  
Moved by such faith one will proceed to worship that divinity and 22  
consequently one will receive from it all that one desires from it, but  
it is God who grants these desires

Still, the reward of one's worship of mere divinities is small and 23  
finite, for those who sacrifice to gods will go to these gods and the  
joy and the life of these gods are limited. So when they have been  
united with the gods they will in due time fall with the gods. If, how-  
ever, one is lovingly devoted to God himself and if one knows that  
by the very acts by which the gods are worshipped God himself is  
propitiated, and if one renounces one's interest in a limited reward,  
one will approach God to please him alone and one will nevermore  
return to samsāra <sup>323</sup> The others, who do not do so, cause even God's 24  
descent among men — which is meant to enable them to resort to  
him — to be insignificant for they do not know that God's supreme  
being is eternal and incomparable, but are under the delusion that God  
is only a prince who was not manifest before his life on earth and  
who has now become manifest <sup>324</sup> for the simple reason that his karmān  
has caused him to become manifest. So they do not resort to God and  
never propitiate him with acts

<sup>319</sup> R derives this sense from the two foregoing verses.

<sup>320</sup> *prakṛtyā nityatāh ityāḍ G = R vāsanāyā gunamayābhāvātīyayāḍ  
nityānūṣṭhāh*

<sup>321</sup> *G nityama-*

<sup>322</sup> viz of the fact that gods constitute God's body, R. refers to BĪU 37,9  
(M) compare also GBh. 311/12

<sup>323</sup> R. refers to G 8,14

<sup>324</sup> *G tyaktvān āpauṇam (R. = prāptam) 'having become an individual'*

## 8 Why God is not manifest

25 *Question* But why then is God not manifest to them?

**Answer** God is not manifest to all because He is concealed by māyā, that is the ksetrajñā's conjunction with the generic structure of man etc.<sup>305</sup> So people do not know God they see in him only the man and do not know that his acts are greater than those of Vayu and Indra, his lustre more brilliant than the sun's, that He is unborn, undying, the cause of all worlds, the Lord of all, and that He has subjected himself to the generic structure of man only to be a refuge for all. Though being acquainted with God who is born a son of Vasudeva's to be a refuge for all and who still retains his divine knowledge of all beings past, present and future nobody realizes that God is his refuge.

27 Therefore, people who do know are rare In all their previous lives in the sphere of the pairs of opposites which consist of gunas, people have grown accustomed to their preference for or aversion to these pairs of opposites and in every new existence the vasanā of their custom makes them experience this same perplexity which is brought about by the preference and aversion to which the pairs of opposites are subject And this perplexity drives them to the complete perplexity it becomes their nature to have preference for or take aversion to the pairs of opposites and not to have their happiness and unhappiness depend on their union with and separation from God This latter nature is proper to the jñānin but such a nature is never innate

28 When, however the evil which causes people to have preference for or take aversion to the pairs of opposites is annulled by excellent acts accumulated in numerous existences, then in proportion to the relative excellence of their karman they will successively resort to God as their refuge and being freed from their perplexity they will worship God with firm conviction in order 1 to contemplate the atman distinctly from prakṛti,<sup>326</sup> 2 to obtain sovereignty, 3 to attain God<sup>327</sup>

*Question* : How should they live and act?

29 *Answer* When they exert themselves to contemplate the atman

<sup>33</sup> R derives this interpretation from the sense attributed to *māḍā* 'illusion creating influence' supra n 237 *ṛogamāḍā* G = R *saṁsthānaṛogāḍā* *ṛogāḍā* - *ṛogā* has the sense of combination entering into *saṁsthāna* generic structure, cf. Sinha 49-58.

(2) *ju* *īmananamokṣāya* *G = R* *prakṛtya* *vyuktātmastarīṇpadarsanāya* *jarā*  
*īmanā* is taken *aupacārika* for the conjunction of *ātman* with *prakṛti* to  
 connect it with the *lai* *alvārthins* above.

327 resp the objectives of the *kāvalyārtham* *aśvāryārtham* and *jñānam* (supra 716 and infra 81 ff)

distinctly from prakṛti, they will know That Brahman, Adhyatma and Karman<sup>328</sup> The second group<sup>329</sup> will know Sādhvibhūta and Sādhidaiva. All three groups know God in the sacrifices required for periodical and occasional rites, and all of them will in their dying hour know God in a way corresponding to the end to which they aspire

## II ON THE THREE GROUPS OF ASPIRANTS

### 1 Explanation of terms

**Question** What is the meaning of That Brahman, Adhyatma and Karman, which should be known by those who while taking refuge in God aspire to release from old age and death,<sup>330</sup> and what is the meaning of Adhivibhūta and Adhidaiva, which should be known by the aspirants to sovereignty? Which of the three groups is specified by the words Adhijayā? What does it mean? And in what manner do these groups know God in their dying hour?

**Answer** That Brahman is the supreme aksara,<sup>331</sup> the totality of the ksetrajñas, the proper form of the ātman separated from prakṛti, this the aspirants to kaivalya should attain<sup>332</sup> Adhyatma is svabhāva or prakṛti that which is not the ātman but is conjoined with the ātman<sup>333</sup> the subtle elements,<sup>334</sup> their vasanā<sup>335</sup> etc., this the aspirants to kaivalya

<sup>328</sup> tad brahma, adhyātmam, karma, sādhibhūtādhidaivam and sādhiyajnam will be explained infra 8.3.9

<sup>329</sup> R atra ya iti punarnirdeśāt pūrvamurdishyebhyo (i.e. the 1 utarjārthins) न्यः 'dhikārino jñāyante "on account of the repeated १८ another group must be meant here' R takes 29 cā te brahma tad viduḥ kṛtsnam adhyātmam karina cākṣitam to refer to the kaivalyārthins, sādhibhūta- and sādhidai- to the aistvārthins, and sādhiyajña- to all kaivalyārthins, aistvārthins and jñānins alike (infra 8.1 ff.)

<sup>330</sup> that is the kaivalyārthins, see supra n. 326

<sup>331</sup> R connects paramam with akṣaram, on akṣara- he refers to SubālUp. 2.

<sup>332</sup> aspirants to release (mumukṣu-) through knowledge of the ātman, supra 7.16

<sup>333</sup> andātmabhūtam ātman samvadbhijamānam this is contrast to ८. ātmānam dham adhiṣṭṭya pratyagātmatoḥ pratyakṣam paramārthabrahmāśānanam vastu svabhāvo 'dhyātmam ucyate "that reality, which ultimately is the absolutely real brahman which appears as the individual ātman imposed on the body"

<sup>334</sup> R refers here to the pañcāgnyavidyā (ChUp. 5.3.9) where the elements are enumerated

<sup>335</sup> V explains vāsanā tat- (sc. bhūtasākṣma-) saṃsargopādhiṣṭānakarmā- vāsanā 'the compelling habit of knowledge (thought) and action restricted by the natural conjunction of the ātman with prakṛti'.

should relinquish<sup>336</sup> Bhūta is human being etc Karman is the procreative act connected with a woman which causes a human being etc to originate<sup>337</sup> An aspirant to kaivalya should know that all this<sup>338</sup> and all that is connected with it is to be feared and avoided<sup>339</sup>

- 4 Adhibhūta is the transitoriness of the elements, ether etc A particular development of these elements, naturally transient and individually different, are sound, touch etc with their bases The aspirants to aisvarya should know that they must obtain these individually different objects, sound etc, and their bases Adhidaivata connotes the puruṣa, it means 'being beyond the pantheon of Indra, Prajāpati etc' The puruṣa beyond the entire pantheon cognizes objects — sound etc — which are different from the objects cognized by the gods The aspirants to aisvarya must know that they are to cognize these objects

Adhiyajña connotes God He who should be propitiated in sacrifice is God, who is the ātman of the gods who constitute his body, should be propitiated by sacrifices This should be commonly known by all three groups of adhikārins when they perform the great sacrifices of periodical and occasional ritual

## 2 Final conviction in one's dying hour

- 5 Finally,<sup>340</sup> he who represents God in his dying hour will attain that  
6 form in which he has represented God<sup>341</sup> Whatever form of being a man when dying represents to himself, that very form he will attain after his death And this final conviction is determined by his previous  
7 being So, since<sup>342</sup> one's final conviction is determined by that to which one had been accustomed before,<sup>343</sup> one should always represent God day after day until one passes away Therefore perform acts which make you remember God day after day, acts which are proper to your peculiar station and stage of life — e.g. warfare — as well as periodical

<sup>336</sup> R. *tad ubhayaṃ (akṣara- and prakṛti) prāptatya tṛṣṇatya ca munibhīr adhijñātavyaṃ*

<sup>337</sup> R. refers to ChUp 5.91 *pañcamyaṃ śrutān āpān puruṣarataso bhavanti* to prove that *karman-* ('sacrifice ritual act') has the meaning of "sexual intercourse", because the waters are said to be the seminal flood (ChUp 5.7.2), the fire is the womb (5.8.1), the oblation the ejaculation from which the embryo arises (5.8.2) so that 'the waters become beings of human speech' (5.9.1) Cf. my remarks Ch. V

<sup>338</sup> sexual intercourse (*karman-*)

<sup>339</sup> R. connects this with G 8.11 *īd icchanto brahmacāryaṃ caranti*

<sup>340</sup> R. this applies to each of the three groups

<sup>341</sup> R. cites Ādiśharata's case as an example (VP 2.13.32-33)

<sup>342</sup> explication of BhG *tasmāt*

<sup>343</sup> *abhyāsa-*, *abhyāsa-* "regular practise of a mental activity" cf. n. 345



so pass away, they will attain the ātman separated from prakṛti which is equal to God and they will never return to saṁsāra <sup>352</sup>

ε *The worship of the jñānin and the way in which he attains God*

- 14 When the jñānin represents God from the beginning persistently and constantly to himself with his mind focused on God alone, because God is incomparably dear to him and because he cannot sustain his ātman without representing God, and so is in constant yoga, then God himself is the object of his desires, not his mere being,<sup>353</sup> sovereignty etc And God himself, unable to endure separation from his worshipper, will choose him,<sup>354</sup> will grant him the full development of his worship which is favourable to his attainment of God and which annuls all that is incompatible with it, and God will bestow on him his superior love etc

4 *Only the aspirant to aśvarya will return to saṁsāra*

- 15 He who aspires to aśvarya will return to saṁsāra, but the aspirant to kaivalya and the jñānin will not Both the latter who know God's proper form as it is<sup>355</sup> and who are unable to maintain their atman without God because of their ardent love for God, attain God as the perfect fulfilment of their object All worlds within the Egg of Brahmā, in which experiences may be had and aśvarya may be obtained, are, however, transient, therefore the aspirant to aśvarya will necessarily perish as the place to which he aspires perishes Those, however, who attain God will never be born again, because in God they cannot perish

- 17—18 It is well known that a day and a night of Brahmā last for a thousand mahāyugas<sup>356</sup> each At the dawn of a day of Brahma the individual entities existing in the Three Worlds, body, senses, objects and occasions of experience etc, appear from the unevolved which has the condition of Brahma's body, and at the beginning of the night they are again submerged in Brahma's body which is a particular condition
- 19 of the unevolved After a century of days and nights of Brahma all

<sup>352</sup> *sa yāti paramāṇi gatim* G = R. *prakṛtivyūktaṁ matsamānākāram apunarūṣṭiṁ ātmanam prāpnōti* the atman is equal to God inasmuch as it will never return to saṁsāra To corroborate this interpretation of *paramāṇi gatim* R. quotes 8,21, where the expression stands for *akṣara*

<sup>353</sup> *madbhāva*, a mode of God's being', sc. the atman

<sup>354</sup> R. quotes KathUp. 2,23 and G 10,10-11

<sup>355</sup> *mahātmamah* G = R. *mahāmanaso yathāvasthītamatsvarūpaṁ jñānah*

<sup>356</sup> *id* 8,19 however R. writes 1000 yugas.

worlds, including Brahmā's world and Brahmā himself, are submerged: the earth is dissolved in water, water in fire etc.; and successively everything, including the unevolved, is dissolved in God. So,<sup>357</sup> those who aspire to aiśvarya being subject to origination and annihilation, they will necessarily return to saṁsāra.

### 5. God's three spheres of dominion.

Beyond the unevolved, which is non-spiritual prakṛti, there is a state 20 of being which is more elevated because it is the end of man. It is not in the same category as the unevolved, because it has only one form: knowledge. It cannot be clarified by pramāṇas,<sup>358</sup> its particular form is only known to itself. Moreover, it is not subject to origination and annihilation, so it is eternal. It is called the unevolved eternal, and those 21 who know the Vedas call it the highest end.<sup>359</sup> Now this eternal being is the pure ātman in its proper form, separated from prakṛti. This being, from which one can never return after having reached it, is God's supreme sphere of dominion.<sup>360</sup> In other words, there are three spheres of dominion 1. the non-spiritual prakṛti, 2. the spiritual prakṛti consisting of ātmans created conjointly with non-spiritual prakṛti, 3. God's supreme sphere of dominion, the released ātman in its proper form, no longer conjoined with act.

This pure ātman is the end to which the aspirant to kaivalya aspires 22 The end, however, to which the jñānin aspires, is entirely different. That is the Supreme Person, God himself, who can only be attained by exclusive bhakti.<sup>361</sup>

### 6. The road of return and the road of no return

Now it is said by which road one may attain God. This road is 23—24 common to both the one who knows the ātman as it really is and the one who is fixedly devoted to the Supreme Person.<sup>362</sup> Once a man<sup>363</sup>

<sup>357</sup> cf. supra 16 with which R. connects st. 17-19

<sup>358</sup> R.'s explication of BhG. *avyakta-*, as in 225.

<sup>359</sup> R. cites 12,3 and 15,16 on *atyakta-* and *akṣara-*.

<sup>360</sup> *dhāma* BhG = R. *niyamanasthānam*; he gives an alternative paraphrase of *dhāma* "splendour, > light of knowledge": the supreme *dhāma* is the proper form of the released ātman which is beyond prakṛti-conjoined ātman because the latter is limited and the former unlimited knowledge.

<sup>361</sup> on God's transcendence R. cites 7,7; 13, on bhakti R. quotes BhG 8,14

<sup>362</sup> resp. the kaivalyārthī and the jñānin.

<sup>363</sup> R.: belonging to either category according to the śruti. R.'s references to the pañcāgnividyā are apparently due to the two roads spoken of in ChUy. 5,10 parallel to the Guā's roads of light and darkness. The śruti meant here in con-



has passed by this road, so the *śrutis* assert, he will nevermore return  
 25 Now it is explained by which road <sup>304</sup> the yogins will not return, but  
 26 those who have good *karman* <sup>305</sup> left will still return When one arrives  
 27 by the bright road, one will not return, but when one arrives by  
 the dark road <sup>306</sup> one will return If a yogin knows both ways, he will  
 not be perplexed when he dies, but he will tread his own divine <sup>307</sup>  
 road Therefore one should be a yogin who has practised yoga which  
 means reflecting on this way day after day for a long time

### 7 The reward of knowledge

28 When one knows the excellence of the Lord which has been ex-  
 pounded in Lectures VII and VIII, the happiness which this knowledge  
 excites will cause one to regard the reward of all good acts, such as  
 regular study of the Vedas, regular practice of sacrifices, austerities,  
 charity and the like, as negligible When one has become a yogin and  
 a *jñānin* one will reach that most original state to which a *jñānin*  
 may aspire

nection with both categories is ChUp 5.10.1 *tad ya ittham vidur ye ceme 'ranse*  
*śraddhā tapa ity upāsate te rciṣam abhisaṃbhajanti ye vidur* R takes to  
 refer to the *kaivalyarthins* *ye ca upāsate* to the *jñānins* he contends that a  
 distinction must have been intended otherwise the clause *ye ca* would not be  
 accounted for The knowledge of the latter category as expressed in this clause  
 he connects with the *daharavidyā* (ChUp 8.1) whereas the knowledge of the *jñā-*  
*nins* corresponds to the *paravidyā* (ChUp 8.7) (compare also R 3.0) The *pañ-*  
*cāgnividya* R continues, explains (in 5.9.5.10.7) that *karman* good or evil, is  
 the reason of the *atman's* embodied existence and that the *atman* is merely en-  
 compassed ( *pariṣṭāngamātram*) by the elements (e.g. the waters of ChUp 5.9.1)  
 with which it is conjoined Thus this *śruti* implicitly discriminates between *cit*  
 and *acit* If then in 5.10.1 and 4.15.6 (coupled by R apparently because the  
 latter passage begins *sa enam brahma gamayati* which — with *enām* — returns  
 in 5.10.2) it is said that those 'who know go to the light and never return it  
 must be because those are able to discriminate between *cit* and *acit* From the  
 fact that both *kaivalyarthins* and *jñānins* attain Brahman it follows that pure  
 released *atman* substance is a *śeṣa* of Brahman who in its *atman* the same follows  
 from *latkratunivā-* ('like worship like result') Moreover that the *atman* is  
 a *śeṣa* is proved by BĀU 3.7.22 (M) see also my remarks in Ch V, p 31 f

<sup>304</sup> R. takes *kālam* pregnantly (*upalakṣaṇārtha* 'serving a donner à titre  
 implicite tel enseignement supplémentaire' Renou Terminologie s.v.) as road,  
 the road under discussion being crowded by divinities which represent time units  
 same explication in CBh 4.2.24 on which see Ch IV p 13

<sup>305</sup> R. takes *G yogin* to mean *puṇyakarman* a person still subjected to  
*karman* will return to *saṃsāra*

<sup>306</sup> the one mentioned in 23.24 and the one mentioned in 25 respectively

<sup>307</sup> R. implicitly refers to the *devayana-* of ChUp 5.10.2.

### III ON THE EXCELLENCE OF THE SUPREME PERSON, ON THE DIFFERENT KINDS OF JÑANINS AND ON THE PROPER FORM OF BHAKTI

#### 1. The kind of knowledge to be explained.

That most secret knowledge — which is worship by bhakti — <sup>368</sup> 9, 1 will now be explained together with the special knowledge <sup>369</sup> concerning this worship. It is through this knowledge, completed by its actualization, that one will be freed from all evil which is incompatible with the attainment of God. It is the knowledge of the high-minded beings <sup>370</sup> 2 who must keep this secret.<sup>371</sup> It purifies one completely of all defects incompatible with the attainment of God. When worshipped in the spirit of bhakti God is evident to his worshipper. It is a means of attaining God who in his form of perfect bliss is most dear to his worshipper; <sup>372</sup> still in itself this worship is blissful <sup>373</sup> to the worshipper because it is very dear to him and therefore favours the contemplation of God. Moreover, it is easy to acquire bhakti; it can be acquired by uncommon love. And it is everlasting, for once a man has attained God he will lose it never more. In other words, when he is worshipping God in this way, he has nothing more to do, were God to give Himself up to him.<sup>374</sup>

When, however, a person is qualified for this worship, which is <sup>3</sup> here called dharma, and yet lacks the faith which presupposes confidence, he will not attain God but stick to the road of saṃsāra or death.

#### 2. The excellence of God.

This entire universe, composed of spiritual and non-spiritual entities, <sup>4</sup>

<sup>368</sup> *bhaktirūpam upāsandkhyam jñānam.*

<sup>369</sup> *vijñāna-* G. = R. *viśeṣajñāna-*; cf. supra n. 285.

<sup>370</sup> R. proposes two alternatives for *rājavidyā*: *vidyānām rāja* and *rājñām vidyā*, the latter explained by *mahāmanasām vidyā*, "for kings have a broad and profound mind".

<sup>371</sup> *rājagūhya-* explained as "to be kept secret by the profound-minded who are skilled in keeping secrets secret".

<sup>372</sup> R. *dharmya-* from *dharma-* "means for bliss" (*niḥśreyasasādhana-*).

<sup>373</sup> *susukham.*

<sup>374</sup> *evamrūpam upāsānam kurvato matpradāne kṛte 'pi na kiṃcit kṛtam mayāsyeti me pratibhānti arthaḥ*; V. connects this with the foregoing in this way: *tārhi kim anyad adhikaṃ sādhyam iti saṅkhyām abhipretam*; I take *na kiṃcit kṛtam* as a construction of the type  $\sqrt{kr-}$  with instr. + negation "to have nothing to do with": thus "practising this form of worship he has to do nothing else with Me: that is quite sufficient, more is impossible". It might be explained differently (as Govindācārya does): *mayā* subject, *asya* gen. pro dat. "for him, for his sake", thus "I have done nothing for him, even if I have given myself up to him".

- is pervaded by God who is its inner ruler. God pervades the spiritual and non-spiritual entities of this world by being their inner ruler,<sup>375</sup> and He does so in order to reign and maintain them, although they themselves are unable to see him. In this way all beings depend on God because they constitute his body. But God does not depend on them for they serve no purpose in maintaining his being; nor does God contain
- 5 these beings like a jug contains water. How, then, does God pervade them? In virtue of his will. Behold his yoga, miraculous and peculiar to him alone: God supports all beings, but no being is of use to him.
- 6 It is his will which originates, sustains and rules the beings. For example, just as the gale in the ether, which roams where it listeth but finds no support in the ether, is upheld by God who can approach it because He maintains it, so all beings depend on God who, though not conjoined with them by nature, supports them by his own miraculous
- 7 power.<sup>376</sup> And not only the maintenance and activity but also the origination and annihilation of all beings depend on the will of God. At the end of Brahmā's life<sup>377</sup> all beings, whether mobile or immobile, will in obedience to God's will dissolve in the prakṛti<sup>378</sup> which constitutes God's body and in which no individual distinctness by name-and-form can possibly exist; and at the beginning of a new kalpa God creates
- 8 these beings anew: reposing upon his own prakṛti, which is capable of development into various shapes, God creates the fourfold creation of gods, men, animals and immovables every now and then by means of his bewildering prakṛti<sup>379</sup> which consists of guṇas. He develops this prakṛti into eight forms.<sup>380</sup>

### 3. God is not bound by his acts.

- 9 *Question.* But if this is true, is God, then, not bound by his acts, such as the creation of unequal beings, when we take into consideration that these acts result in cruelty?

*Answer.* No, God is not bound by his acts, such as the creation of unequal beings, nor do these acts bring about any cruelty in God, for

<sup>375</sup> R. refers to BĀU. 3,7,22 (M.).

<sup>376</sup> R. quotes BĀU. 3,8,9; TaittUp. 8,1 and an unidentified stanza.

<sup>377</sup> paraphrasis of G. *kalpakāye*.

<sup>378</sup> the unevolved prakṛti or tamas: R. refers to Manu 1,5/8; SubālUp. 7 and RV. 8,7,17.

<sup>379</sup> G. *avaśam* is explained "not by their own will but by the power of prakṛti".

<sup>380</sup> R. has BhG. 7,4 in mind in this entire passage.

it is the previous karman of the individual atmans themselves which causes the inequality of the conditions in which these beings exist<sup>391</sup> God himself has no interest in this inequality, He sits apart from it, as an outsider God's prakṛti, supervised by God himself, creates the world<sup>392</sup> with its mobile and immobile beings in accordance with the karman of the individual atmans embodied in these beings 10

#### 4 *How God is regarded by the ignorant and by the wise*

Urged upon by this compassion for mankind, God has assumed a human body so that He might be the refuge of all men, but they do not know him as He is They consider him to be a man like they are, and they are ignorant of God's supreme state of being which is a boundless receptacle of compassion, generosity, goodness, love etc and is characterized by its human shape So for the mere reason that God is their refuge in human shape, they consider him to be of the same class as other human beings and so are mistaken about him They have assumed the bewildering natures of raksasas and asuras which puts an end to God's supreme compassion in his humanity, their aspirations and enterprises remain fruitless, their knowledge of all God's creatures and of God himself is erroneous, and they have lost all positive knowledge of anything<sup>393</sup> because they regard God as a man 11 12

Those, however, whose good karman enables them to take refuge in God and who, released from the bondage of evil, assume a divine nature, know God to be the origin of all beings, the eternal Lord whose proper form, name and actions are beyond thought and speech and who has descended into human shape to rescue the sadhus and they worship God with all their minds focused on him alone Because of their extreme love of God their minds, atmans and external organs lack all support no sooner than they cease to worship him by bhakti or to praise him or to exert themselves for his sake, therefore they meditate on the names which denote God's special qualities In an ecstasy of joy they glorify him by crying out his names Narayana, Kṛṣṇa, Vasudeva etc. and resolutely exert themselves to act for the glory of God, by worship and by the means of worship such as the building of temples, gardens 13 14

<sup>391</sup> R cites VS 2.1.34.35

<sup>392</sup> R cites ÇvetUp 4.9.10

<sup>393</sup> *vicetasah* G = R. *sarcaltra jagatayāthātmavajñānah* cf 3.32 *cetahkūṛjam* hi *jastayāthātmav* *uscajah*

and groves, and they prostrate themselves indifferent to dust, mud and gravel with the eight members of the body<sup>384</sup> desirous of everlasting union with God.

- 15 Other high-minded<sup>385</sup> believers worship God by paying homage to him not only in the above way but also by performing the sacrifice called *jñāna*. What does that mean? They worship God as the One underlying the individual plurality of things.<sup>386</sup> This means that they worship God with the certain knowledge that God is one and that his body is constituted by the manifold creation of gods, men, animals and immovables, because at the time when his body consisted of infinitely subtle spiritual and non-spiritual substances incapable of individual distinctness by name-and-form, God has decided on this volition: Be My body constituted by gross spiritual and non-spiritual mass which exists in a plurality of individual forms distinguishable by name-and-
- 16 form.<sup>386</sup> So God's body is the universe, God is the sacrifice, *jyotiṣṭoma* etc., the *mahāyajñas*, the libation and oblation offered to nourish the deceased ancestors, the *havis*, the mantra, the clarified butter, the fire
- 17 which conveys the sacrifices, and the *homa*. He is father, mother, grandfather and establisher<sup>387</sup> of the world consisting of mobile and immobile creatures. He is the means of purification, the One to be known by the Vedas. He is the *Om* syllable, the core of the Vedas. He
- 18 is the Veda composed of *ṛc*, *yajus* and *sāman*. He is the end to be attained, the supporter, the ruler, the immediate witness, the residence, the spiritual resort, the well-meaning friend. He is the place<sup>388</sup> of origination and annihilation of whatever wherever, He is all that can be begotten or destroyed,<sup>389</sup> He is the imperishable cause of all

<sup>384</sup> the members of the body represent (*abhimānin-*) the worshipper's mind and buddhi which are bowed down under the burden of *bhakti*.

<sup>385</sup> *mahātmanah* repeated from verse 14.

<sup>386</sup> *mām upāsate ekatvena prthaktvena bahudhā viśvatomukham* G. = R. *jagadākāreṇa* (≈ *bahudhā prthaktvena*) *viśvaprakāram* (≈ *viśvatomukham*) *avasthitam mām ekatvenopāsate* "although God is modified by everything when he appears in the shape of the universe, they worship him as the one underlying principle"

<sup>387</sup> Compare the oft-cited *śruti tad aikṣata bahu syām* etc. (Ch.Up. 6,2,3).

<sup>388</sup> R. *atra dhātṛśabdo mātṛpitṛvyatirikta utpattiḥprajayake cetanaviśeṣe vartate*.

<sup>389</sup> R. reads *prabhavaḥ pralayaḥ sthānam* for *prabhavaḥ pralayaḥ sthānam*; V. unconvincingly explains it: *kevalam brahmāder avyaktāder tād yad utpattiḥpralayaḥ sthānam*, obviously to avoid a superfluous repetition of what has adequately been expressed by *pitāham* etc. in 17.

<sup>390</sup> *nidhānam* is explained as "all that can be laid down, either by birth or by death".

that God heats in the form of fire, the sun etc at the beginning of 19  
 summer, then again He stops the rains and pours out the rains He is  
 both that through which one lives<sup>390</sup> and that through which one dies  
 He is the present, the past and the future Those who through their  
 knowledge of this essential unity of God realize that the whole world  
 is a modification of God because God's body is constituted by the  
 names and-forms of a plurality of individual beings and who worship  
 God as such, those are the true mahatmans<sup>391</sup>

Those people, on the other hand, who are firmly fixed on the Vedas 20  
 and not on the Vedānta,<sup>392</sup> who drink the soma beverage which is proper  
 to the worship of mere divinities like Indra as prescribed by the Vedas,  
 who are only purified from evil incompatible with the attainment of  
 heaven, and who aspiring to heaven sacrifice to God as though He him-  
 self were the divinities because they do not know who God really is,  
 those people will attain the world of Indra which is free from unhappi-  
 ness and enjoy divine pleasures But when the good karman which led 21  
 them to heaven is consumed, they will return to the world of mortals  
 Because they lack the knowledge taught by the Vedānta<sup>393</sup> they will  
 return to samsāra after having enjoyed the immaterial and transient  
 pleasures of heaven

The mahātman, however, will not return, for their only end in 22  
 life is the meditation on God, because without it they are unable to  
 sustain their atmans They worship God in all his glory while aspiring  
 to constant union with him,<sup>394</sup> and God will lead them to yoga or attain-  
 ment of God and to ksema or no return<sup>395</sup>

The ignorant, however<sup>396</sup>, are devoted to mere divinities and so 23  
 rely on the Vedas alone and faithfully sacrifice to these divinities But  
 while doing so they actually sacrifice to God himself,<sup>397</sup> for everything  
 constitutes God's body and as God is the atman of everyone and  
 everything, He may be called by the names of these divinities But the  
 ignorant perform their sacrifices without connecting them with the

<sup>390</sup> paraphrasis of G amṛta-

<sup>391</sup> from II again with which R connects 14-19

<sup>392</sup> R. *travīdya* = the three Vedas, *travīdya*- 'who relies only on the three Vedas, not on the Vedānta, the way of worship of those who rely on the latter having been treated of above 13 19

<sup>393</sup> viz. that everything = a modification of God, cf supra 3,31

<sup>394</sup> *niṣābhīyuktānām* G = R *mayi niṣābhīyogaṃ kankṣamānānām*

<sup>395</sup> <yoga- 'union and kṣema- 'safety (from samsāra)''.

<sup>396</sup> R. reads *ye tu* for *ye 'py*

<sup>397</sup> cf 7,21

words of the Vedānta<sup>398</sup> As has been stated before,<sup>399</sup> the entire Vedānta lays down the doctrine that the divinities are to be worshipped in so far as they constitute the body of the Supreme Person but that it actually is the Supreme Person himself who is the one to be worshipped, because He is their ātman When performing their sacrifices the four hotṛs will find the fulfilment of their desires via the divinities — who constitute God's body — in God who is the inner ruler of these divinities, or, in other words, when they know that by their acts they pay homage to God himself and then perform these acts — serving to reconcile the divinities —, they will find in God the perfect fulfilment  
 24 of their aspirations The ignorant, however, do not know this, so their reward is but a small one and it is in their nature to fall back to saṁsāra

### 5 The importance of the worshipper's intention

25 One may exclaim How wondrous is this difference that, though devoting themselves to one and the same act, some partake of a very small reward and then fall back by nature and others partake of a reward which means the attainment of God — that is perfect boundless bliss —, for the mere reason that both differ in their intentions!

In this trend the text proceeds: those who intend<sup>400</sup> worshipping Indra etc will go to the gods those who intend worshipping the deceased ancestors will go to them, those who intend worshipping ghosts will go to them Those, however, who worship God while uttering the intention Let us worship by these same sacrifices the Supreme Ātman himself, the Lord Vasudeva whose body is constituted by gods, deceased ancestors and ghosts, — those will go to God and never return

26 The worshippers of God are distinguished too There are votaries who lovingly offer God a leaf, a flower, a fruit or water, things which are available to anyone If someone offers God such a leaf etc with pious intention, this offering being his sole object<sup>401</sup> because his uncommon love for God urges him on to make this offering, then God

<sup>398</sup> *avādhīpūrvakam* G = R *Indrādīnāṃ devatānāṃ karmasv āvādhīyate-jānīyateṣu yathā vedāntaśākyāṃ catur hotāro yatra sampadam gacchanti devaish ityādīni vidadhātī na tatpūrvakīm yajante* they do not sacrifice after first having connected the utterings of the Vedānta (viz that the only fit object of worship is God whose body is constituted by gods etc) with the Vedic obligation of worshipping divinities like Indra through sacrificial acts — the aptly quoted passage is TaittĀr 3 11 2

<sup>399</sup> Above 331

<sup>400</sup> R *īratatābdah saṁkalpavācī*

<sup>401</sup> *prayatātmanah* G = R. *tatpradānaukāpṛajojanat arūpaśuddhiyuktama-nasali*

will even accept this leaf etc and partake of them because He will hold them dear, although He can never have experience of anything but himself and although this leaf etc are foreign to his desire <sup>402</sup>

This distinction, incomprehensible by speech and thought, is peculiar 27 to the jñānins who are mahātmans. Therefore, one should become a mahatman and, with one's atman bowed down under the burden <sup>403</sup> of bhakti and while worshipping God by praise and offerings, glorification and prostration, perform profane and Vedic acts, such as periodical and occasional rites etc. All profane acts except those performed to sustain the body, and all food taken to sustain the body, as well as all Vedic acts — sacrifice, charity etc — should be performed as offerings to God. Inasmuch as the divinities — who are the objects of sacrificial worship etc — are of God, <sup>404</sup> as oneself — being the agent of the acts and the experiencer of the objects — is also of God <sup>404a</sup> and as all being, existence and activity depend on God's will, one should offer oneself — as agent, experiencer and worshipper — as well as all worship and all worshipped gods, up to God himself who is the Supreme sesin, the Supreme Agent. Animated by excessive love one should realize that one's sole essence is to be a sesa of God — the which presupposes submission to God's dominion — and that everything else — objects of worship etc — fundamentally is a sesa of God. Then, while directing 28 one's mind to the yoga called samnyasa, <sup>405</sup> one will be released from the bondage of previous karman, whether good or evil, which is incompatible with the attainment of God, and consequently attain God.

## 6 All beings are equal for God

Being a refuge for all God is the same toward all atmans of gods, 29 men, animals and immovables, which, according to their class, configuration, <sup>406</sup> nature and knowledge, exist in an infinite plurality of forms, from the highest to the lowest. No one who has resorted to God will be abandoned by God because his humble class, configuration, nature and knowledge is odious to Him, and no one who has resorted to God together with a humbler votary is more beloved of God because of his more exalted class etc. All beings who worship God by bhakti —

<sup>402</sup> R quotes MBh. 12, 171 63-64

<sup>403</sup> I read *bhaktibhāra-* with the *varia lectio*, cf supra 9 14

<sup>404</sup> being *śeṣas* of God who is their *śeṣin*, and bodies of God who is their ātman, (cf 7,21)

<sup>404a</sup> who is the Supreme Agent cf supra 3,30.

<sup>405</sup> jñānayoga, or rather jñāna in karmayoga, supra 5, 1 ff

<sup>406</sup> *ākāra-*.



whether they be of an exalted or a humble class — will at their desire foregather in God as if they share his virtues, and God himself will dwell in them as if they are more exalted than He

- 30 When a man worships God excessively and has no other end in mind than the worshipping of God, then, even if he has transgressed the rules of the class to which he belongs, he should be regarded as a leading Vaisnava and esteemed as highly as one of the aforementioned votaries. Now what can be the reason for this? The reason is that his conviction <sup>407</sup> is right, the conviction that God, the sole cause of the universe, the Supreme Brahman, Nārayana, Lord of all mobile and immobile beings, our Master, is his friend, his teacher, his highest object of worship. Such a conviction is difficult to form for everyone, but he has been able to form it and moreover he accepts its consequences and worships God continuously with no other end in view. Therefore he should be esteemed as a sadhu, all his transgressions of rules should not be belittled as just a negligible offence, but on the contrary regarded as a respectable action.

### 7 Argument

- 31 *Objection* — But certainly this practice of love and worship will not continue developing into ever more exalted practices if the worshipper has transgressed the rules of his class, for that is contradicted by the śruti <sup>408</sup>.
- Answer* — He will be purified of sin in consequence of his exclusive worship of God which results from his love for God, and his rajas and tamas gunas will be eradicated so that his mind, released from incompatible factors and supported by favourable factors, will soon be focused on God alone <sup>409</sup>. Through this worship he will attain everlasting *sānti*, <sup>410</sup> that is, he will nevermore return to *samsāra* and refrain from all actions incompatible with the attainment of God. This must be avowed that a person who has begun to worship God by *bhakti* will not perish, even though some of his actions may be incompatible with his attainment of God, but that the excellence of his *bhakti* will help him to refrain
- 32 from all such actions and then his *bhakti* will soon be perfect. So even

<sup>407</sup> *vyaśāṣya-*

<sup>408</sup> *KāthUp* 2,24, this śruti is obviously selected on account of the term *afānta-* which occurs in it.

<sup>409</sup> *dharmātma* G = R. *śirodharahitaparikaramadbhajanāikamanā*, for this sense of *dharma-* see *supra* 9,3.

<sup>410</sup> R expressly refers on *sānti* to 9,3 where *dharma-* was however taken to mean *bhakti*, not its reward *sānti*.

women, vaiśyas, sūdras, however evil their origin may be, will attain the highest end when they attain God, let alone brahmins and rājarsis, 33 whose origin is auspicious, if they devote themselves to bhakti! Therefore Arjuna — who is a rājarsi — should worship God by bhakti as long as he lives in this transient and miserable world

## 8 Bhakti

One must focus one's mind constantly on God in all his glory. When 34 focusing one's mind on God one must be animated by the most ardent love for God and perform sacrifices for the glory of God because one cognizes Him as the incomparably adorable One. But one must not stop at merely exerting oneself in this manner, one must resolve to prostrate oneself before God who is one's inner a'tman. Then, when one has found one's sole support on God and in virtue of boundless and unsurpassed love enabled one's mind to experience Him, one shall attain Him.

## IV ON GOD'S INFINITE BEAUTIFUL QUALITIES AND ON GOD'S ACTUATING THE ENTIRE UNIVERSE

### 1 Knowledge of God's nature expels all evil and gives rise to bhakti

Neither the gods nor the great sages, however supernatural their 10, 1—2 vision may be and however great their knowledge, know God's supernal manifestation,<sup>411</sup> i.e. they do not know God's name, acts, proper form and being etc., because God himself is the beginning of their own proper form and of their knowledge, power etc. The knowledge which God has granted them in accordance with their good karman is limited and therefore they do not know God's proper form as it really is. Now, this true knowledge of God's proper form — which is incom- 3 prehensible to gods etc. — is a means to expel all evil incompatible with the origination of bhakti. He who knows that God is unborn because his proper form is opposed to all conjunction with evil and therefore not subjected to it,<sup>412</sup> that He has no beginning<sup>413</sup> and that He is the

<sup>411</sup> *prabhatam* G = R. *prabhātam*, V explains *īśvare vidyamānaś ca prabhavaḥ prakarṣeṇa satāḥprabhava eva bhavitum arhatīty abhīprāpyeṇa* the cause that is in God can only be the cause of his being superior."

<sup>412</sup> and therefore, R. adds, of an order different from non spiritual and spiritual beings, for the embodied ātman too has known birth: its birth is its conjunction with prakṛti.

<sup>413</sup> and therefore of a different order from the released ātman: the released ātman may be unborn (having no conjunction with prakṛti), but its being unborn

overlord of all the world's lords, is released from all factors incompatible with the origination of bhakti. Such a one is not subject to that total confusion<sup>414</sup> which induces one to classify in the same order certain elements which do not belong to that order. For instance, in the world of man someone belonging to the class of men who are not kings may by some means or other attain royalty and therefore is of the same order as kings in the same manner the sovereign of the gods, nay, the sovereign of Brahma's Egg himself is of the same order as all other beings in samsara, because even he is comprised by the three bhavanas<sup>415</sup>. Now, when one is not subject to the confusion that God too is of that same order of beings in samsara but when one knows that God the Sovereign of the universe, does solely comprise all that is beautiful and is antagonistic to all that is evil, and that He is of an order altogether different from that of all cit in bondage — whether cause or effect — and from that of all released spiritual beings, then one is freed from all evil.

## 2 The realization of the variety of God's dominion and qualities augments one's bhakti

4—5 All faculties and dispositions<sup>416</sup> enumerated in these verses,

has had a beginning at the moment that it was released after having been conjoined with prakṛti. On God's opposition to the released atman R quotes ÇvetUp 6.19 *niravadājam* meaning that God has never suffered conjunction with prakṛti.

<sup>414</sup> cf. R's definition of *asañimoha-* ad 10.4 *pūrvavaghlitā rajatāder vajrāṅgī* sī *kṛkādivastuṃ saṃśṛīyātābuddhīmuvṛtiṃ*.

<sup>415</sup> *tasyāpi* (sc. *brahmāṇḍādhipater*) *bhāvanātrayaṇtargatatvāt*. V. karma *bhāvanā brahmabhāvanobhayaabhāvanā bhāvanātrayaṃ* the first category that can be reflected upon as being karman are the created beings the second category that can be reflected upon as being *brahmā* is Brahma the sovereign of the Cosmic Egg Hiranyagarbha the creator etc. the third category that can be reflected upon as being either or both *karman* and *Brahmā* are divine beings like Sanat kumara Rudra etc. (acc. to V. R. refers to the last category with *je kecanāni mādayasvaryaṃ prāptāḥ*) all three categories are subjected to karman (cf. Ved p. 199 *tadeta-* (sc. *trayanmanuṣya*) *brahmātmāṃ bhāvanātrayaṇvayena karmavaśyatvaṃ*) and therefore of one and the same order. The terms are borrowed from VP 7.6.48 ff. which are discussed ÇBh. 1.1.1 p. 70 (Th. p. 89 f.) cf. also Lacombe Notes 586. The variant reading *tasyāpi bhāvanātrayaṇtargatatvāt* (because even he is confined to the three worlds) is a *lectio facilior*.

<sup>416</sup> *bhāvāḥ* G = R *pravṛttimvṛttihetavo manovṛttayah*. R gives definitions among which the following may be noted *buddhir manaso nirāpanasāma rthyam* b. is the mind's faculty of ascertaining. G *bhāva* is taken synonymously with *bhavana-* (V. *uddharṣa*) *anukīlānubhavaheṭi kaṇi manaso bhāvanam* gladness of the mind resulting from agreeable cognitions *ablāṇa pratikīlānu bhavaheṭukam manaso vasādam* sadness of the mind resulting from disagreeable cognitions.

resulting either from activity or from inactivity, are dependent on God's volition. So too is the activity of those who further the creation and maintenance of all beings, viz the seven maharsis of a past manvantara who were begotten by Brahma's mind to further the creation permanently, as well as the four manus who exist to further the maintenance of the created beings permanently. All those, maharsis and manus, derive their existence from God,<sup>417</sup> that is, they are obedient to God's volition. He who truly knows this supernal manifestation of God, i.e. that all origination, existence and activity depends on God and who knows truly that God is conjoined with beautiful qualities<sup>418</sup> and is antagonistic to all evil he then will indubitably possess unswerving bhakti. The sages who know God in this way love him passionately<sup>419</sup> with their mind focused on him and their atmans depending on him they acquaint one another with God's qualities of which they have direct cognizance and they tell one another of his divine adorable actions, and then the narrators are pleased by the questions of their listeners and the listeners delight in listening to the narrative.

To those who wish to attain permanent union with God<sup>420</sup> and who love God He grants fully matured buddhiyoga accompanied by love by which they may attain Him. Moreover, to favour them with his grace, God while being the object of their mental activity<sup>421</sup> and while revealing his beautiful qualities dispels their normal propensity to objects other than God — resulting from previous karman incompatible with true knowledge — by means of the knowledge of God which is of the same order as God.

### 3 God's supernal manifestation

*Question* : God is the Supreme Brahman, the supreme splendour,<sup>422</sup> the supreme sanctifier, as the *śrutis* assert.<sup>423</sup> All those who have exact knowledge of higher and lower entities, such as the *ṛsis* Narada, Asita

<sup>417</sup> = G *madbhā āh*

<sup>418</sup> = G *yogam*, cf. supra 95

<sup>419</sup> G *bhāṣasamantatah* R *bhāṣo manorjhitānaseṣaḥ* (cf. supra), *mayo sṛṣṭhā-jalā-ro mān bhajanta ity arthaḥ*

<sup>420</sup> = G *yoga*

<sup>421</sup> *ātmanādvasthah* G = R. *tejāṃ manorjhitau vṛjyatatādvasthātāḥ* (from existing (*stha*) in their mental activity (*bhāṣa*) as its object (*ātman*))"

<sup>422</sup> but for a different interpretation of *dhāman* cf. supra 8,21

<sup>423</sup> on *Brahman*- R. refers to TaittUp. 3.1 and MundUp. 3.2.9, on *dhāman*- to ChUp. 3.137 8.12.2 BĀU 4.4.16, on 'Sanctifier' to ChUp. 4.14.3, 5.24 on the general idea to MahānārUp. 4.11 *Nārāyaṇaḥ param brahma tatitvam Nārāyaṇaḥ paraḥ / Nārāyaṇaḥ param jyotiḥ śīmā Nārāyaṇaḥ paraḥ*

- Devala and Vyasa, affirm <sup>424</sup> that God is the eternal divine Personality, the primeval Deity, the unborn One, the paramount Sovereign, and God himself repeats this in our text <sup>425</sup> So Arjuna takes all that God has said concerning his boundless and unrivalled natural dominion and the infinity of his beautiful qualities to be the literal truth and not merely a panegyric, and now he understands why gods and danavas — who possess but a limited knowledge — do not fully know God's manifestation <sup>426</sup> God, the Supreme Person, knows himself by virtue of his own knowledge <sup>427</sup> He is the procreator of all beings the sovereign of all beings, the supreme Deity even of all divinities whom he transcends just as these divinities themselves transcend men, animals etc Therefore God alone is entitled to reveal completely all forms of his divine and personal dominion by means of which he is forever pervading this worlds as its sovereign Now, to what end should God reveal those forms? To enable Arjuna who devotes himself to the loving meditation of God <sup>428</sup> to know God in the over abundance of his beautiful qualities such as dominion etc so that he may meditate on God his Sovereign in more modes than just those of buddhi and knowledge which already have been revealed Therefore God is entreated to reveal in detail his creatorship, <sup>429</sup> his supernal manifestation and his sovereignty <sup>430</sup>
- 19 *Answer* God will now proceed to reveal to Arjuna those forms of his supernal manifestation <sup>431</sup> which are paramount in this world It would not be possible to enumerate all forms in detail because they are endless
- 20 God states explicitly that He governs all beings <sup>432</sup> by actuating them — which He is able to do because He exists as their inner atman — and that He is the One who creates maintains and destroys them God is the atman in all beings which constitute his body, and the ātman is the

<sup>424</sup> R refers to Hariv 123.62 MBh 3.88.23.28 and an unidentified quotation

<sup>425</sup> R refers to G 7.4.10.8

<sup>426</sup> *evaṁ hi* G = R *evāṅjanaprakāśam* the way in which God is manifested

<sup>427</sup> *svayam evātmanā* G = R *svatantra jñānena* knowledge being God's essence

<sup>428</sup> *yogī* G = R *bhaktiyoganiṣṭhah*

<sup>429</sup> *śraṣṭi ādīyogah* God's association with the qualities of being creator etc, God as the creator etc

<sup>430</sup> summarized R adds in G 10.8 *aham sarvasya prabhāvo mattah sarvaṁ pravartate*

<sup>431</sup> R defines *vibhūti* *vibhūtiḥ am nāma mīḍa nṛatam* and proves it by G 10.7 *etāṁ vibhūtiṁ* as referring to 10.5 *bhāṁṇi bhavā bhūtānāṁ matta eva* (where, however *bhāvāḥ* was taken to mean *manorūṭṭayāḥ* not essence etc which he seems to imply here)

<sup>432</sup> *bhūta-* here means body + atman as witness CBh 1.1.1, p. 82 (Th p. 102) *bhūtasabdo hy ātmaparyantodehavacanah*

support, the ruler and the seṣin of the body<sup>433</sup> Being the ātman of all beings God therefore is the cause of their origination, maintenance and dissolution From the fact that God exists as the inner atman of all beings which constitute his dominion it results that God may be called by the names of all these beings in functional co-ordination<sup>434</sup> Therefore, God will presently enumerate the various forms of his dominion in functional co-ordination with himself, this enumeration, as has been said above, comprises only those forms which are paramount in this world So among the ādityas He is the paramount one, Viṣṇu, among all luminaries He is the paramount one, the sun, He is the manas among the eleven senses,<sup>435</sup> He is the Rāma among the bearers of arms<sup>436</sup> Of all creatures He is the cause, i.e. He is the creators of all living beings created in the course of creation, likewise He is their destroyers and their protectors<sup>437</sup> In the same manner He is the A of the alphabet,<sup>438</sup> the dvandva among the various compounds<sup>439</sup> He is Śrī, Kīrti etc among women,<sup>440</sup> He is the game of dice, that most deceitful of all the

<sup>433</sup> so God is the support, ruler and seṣin of all beings R refers to G 15 15, 18 61 and BĀU 3 7,1 22 (M)

<sup>434</sup> *sāmānādhikaraṇya*- R compares this with the usage of words like 'a god, a man a tree which actually denote bodies but include (*parjāyasyanti*) the inherent atmans He refers to 10 39 where it is said that God's being the ātman of all creatures is the condition (*ubandhana*) of his being called by the names of these creatures in *samanādhikaraṇya* for it is said that no being can exist apart from God the same was more positively said in 10 8

<sup>435</sup> Text *ekādaśāṇāṁ indriyāṇāṁ yad utkrāṣṭaṁ mana indriyaṁ tad aham asmi / iyaṁ apī na nirdhāraṇe / bhūtaṇāṁ cetanā, atāṁ vā cetanā sūham asmi*, read *iyam apī na nirdhāraṇe* after *bhūtaṇāṁ asmi*

<sup>436</sup> *śaṣṭrabhytām Rāmo ham* R *śaṣṭrabhytvam atra abhūtīti / arihantārahāvād ādityādyaś ca kṣetrājñā ātmavendāvesthitasya bhagavataḥ śarīratayā dharmabhātāḥ itī śaṣṭrabhytasthantyaḥ* The meaning is this the aforementioned kṣetrājñas, the sun etc (vs. 21 II) constitute themselves dharmas of God for they are his body, Rāma however is God, so Rāma's swordmanship must here be taken as a dharma of God not Rāma himself, so that this swordmanship is on a plane with sun etc., cf also infra n 441

<sup>437</sup> G *āditi, antaḥ* and *madhyaḥ* explained by *śrastārāḥ, saṁhārīdārāḥ* and *palāyīdārāḥ* God is every creator etc. met with by the creatures in the course of creation, as distinct from the prime creator (*Hiranyagarbhaḥ Caturmukhaḥ*), the *dhātṛ*- by whose name God is called in vs 33

<sup>438</sup> for *sartatavāṇāṁ prakṛtiḥ akāraḥ* 'the A is the base of all phonemes' (see Renou Terminologie s.v. *varṇa* and *prakṛti*), R. quotes *Āitār 32,3 akāro tas sartatvāḥ* 'the A is all words'

<sup>439</sup> II sa *ity ubhayaopadāṭhāpradhānattematṛkṣaḥ* 'for the dvandva is the most eminent compound because both terms of which it is composed retain their independence and are not subordinated one to another as in the other compounds'

<sup>440</sup> cf V *kīrtiyāḥ sa neha guṇa-śīḥṣā tvakṛtīḥ / teṣāṁ puruṣeṣu apī ubhāṭatena nāṛtīṇāṁ itī vāṣeṣyogāt / na ca nāṛtībdo 'tra itṛitigopadāṭhika-udāraḥ / mukhyabādhabhātā / ato nāṛtīteṣāṁ nāṛtībhāṣam eva kīryate / itra-*

cheater's opportunities for deceiving Among all members of the Vrsni  
 39 clan He is the son of Vasudeva <sup>441</sup> In short, He is the core, whether  
 manifest or not, of all beings in whatever condition they exist <sup>442</sup> The  
 totality of beings, mobile or immobile, cannot exist apart from God  
 who is the atman within themselves

40 There is no end to the forms of God's supernal manifestation,  
 this detailed discussion of his manifestation is not exhaustive of its  
 41 infinity All entities that are subject to God's dominion <sup>443</sup> all entities  
 that are beautiful or rich, all entities that are prepared for the under-  
 taking of various virtuous enterprises, derive from a fraction of God's  
 unconceivable power of dominion <sup>444</sup>

42 But why should one know all this in detail? This knowledge alone  
 may suffice that God with an infinitesimal fraction of his majesty  
 supports the entire universe consisting of cit and acit, whether effect  
 or cause, gross or subtle and that its proper form, existence and  
 various activities are subservient to God's volition

## V ARJUNA'S PRESENTATION <sup>445</sup> OF THE PROPER FORM OF GOD

### 1 *God is inaccessible to natural perception*

11, 1 *Question* The words by which God has revealed to Arjuna that most  
 profound mystery of the atman in order to show his favour to Arjuna  
 when he was bewildered by the misconception that the atman is the  
 2 body, these words have dispelled his misconception <sup>446</sup> Arjuna has also  
 heard <sup>447</sup> that the origination and dissolution of all beings depend on

ca *Grīṣa eṣa sarvaṇḍrībhyo 'tisayitātāt saṁva prathamam vaktavyā*

<sup>441</sup> R *Vasudevasūnūtām atra nbhūtiḥ | arthāntarābhāvād eva*

<sup>442</sup> R *'na tad asti 'nā syān mayā bhūtam carācaram ity atrāpy āmatayā*  
*vasthānam vi akṣitam (cf n 434) | anena sarvasya sāmānādhikaranyanirdeśa-*  
*syāmatayā arthītur eva hetur itī prakatayati* by this he makes clear that God's  
 being the atman (of all creatures) is the ground for his being denoted by every  
 creature in *sāmānādhikaranyā*

<sup>443</sup> G *vibhūtimat*

<sup>444</sup> R *tejas parābhūbhavanasāmarthyam* the power by which one is able to  
 rule others here esp God's power of dominion (*nyamanasakti*)

<sup>445</sup> *sākṣātkāra*

<sup>446</sup> see ad 28-11 the words which have sublated Arjuna's misconception  
 comprise, according to R, 21-646 (647 marking the transition to the second  
 sūka) where the nature of the atman and the means of contemplating the atman  
 are dealt with

<sup>447</sup> R in Lectures 7-10

God who is the Supreme Ātman, that God's eternal greatness consists in this that all spiritual and non-spiritual entities constitute a *śeṣa* of God, that God is the supreme One because of his beautiful qualities, that God is the foundation of all and that God is the inner actuator of all beings. Now Arjuna desires to have direct presentation of God in his forms of sovereign, creator, maintainer and dissolver of all entities as well as <sup>448</sup> in his form of absolute superiority. Therefore he beseeches God <sup>449</sup> to reveal Himself completely <sup>450</sup> to him in these forms, if that could be possible.

*Answer* Quoth God, Behold my various forms which are the foundation of all, which are constituted by a plurality of modifications and which are supernatural, multicoloured and multiformed. Behold in this one form of Mine all things of which direct experience may be had as well as all things which can only be known from the *śāstras* as well as the many marvelous things which are never yet witnessed before either in the entire universe or in the entire *śāstra*. <sup>451</sup> Behold the entire universe with its mobile and immobile beings concentrated in this one body of Mine and behold therein everything thou wishest to see. But thine eye cannot behold Me such as I am, different in kind from everything else and infinite. By thy natural eye thou canst perceive but things finite and subject to My dominion. Therefore I bestow on thee a supernatural eye by which thou mayest perceive Me. So do now behold My yoga which is association with beautiful qualities and endless supernal manifestations.

## 2 God's Majesty

Then, Saṁjaya relates, God showed Arjuna <sup>452</sup> his supremely majestic form which is the foundation of the entire universe manifold and multiform, and which governs everything. That form or body was splendid <sup>453</sup> and unlimited by space and time, facing all directions and

<sup>448</sup> distinction derived by R. from the separate vocative *puruṣottama*.

<sup>449</sup> *yoga-* in *yogeshvara-* is explained as 'conjunction with beautiful qualities' in reference to *yogam āśvaram* in vs. 8.

<sup>450</sup> *tvam ayyaṁ ite kṛyāṁśaṁ / tvāṁ sakalaṁ me darsayety arthak*

<sup>451</sup> *adityān vāṁśān* etc. are taken to denote implicitly beings known by either *śāstra* or perception, in contradistinction to *adṛṣṭapārādān* *dīcaryān*, beings known neither by *śāstra* nor by perception.

<sup>452</sup> *Pāṇḍya* = R. *pūṣṭasubh Pṛthvīyā putrāya*. R. seems to imply that the use of the metonymic *Pārtha* indicates that God's favour was shown peculiarly to Arjuna because he was Kṛṣṇa's cousin.

<sup>453</sup> *divom* G = R. *dyotamānam* (from *√dyo-* *dyu-*). R. this aspect of God is specified in vs. 12.



- 11—12 adorned with behoving garments, perfumes, garlands, ornaments and  
 13 weapons In that body of the God of gods, infinite in all dimensions,  
 with numberless trunks, mouths and eyes, of unimaginable splendour,  
 equipped with innumerable weapons etc, Arjuna — who by divine  
 Grace had been granted supernatural vision — beheld the entire uni-  
 verse with all its various subdivisions, crowded by the various kinds of  
 classes of experiencing beings — gods, men, animals, immovables etc  
 of all sorts and forms — and by places, objects and means of experien-  
 ces — such as earth, ether, heaven, patala, atala, sutala etc — and  
 consisting of purusa and prakṛti, this entire universe was concentrated  
 14 in one single point of God's body Arjuna was struck with amazement  
 at perceiving the entire universe in one single point of God's body <sup>454</sup>  
 and, while beholding God himself who is the foundation of the entire  
 universe, the actuator of all and the possessor of marvelous beautiful  
 qualities, he was so transported that his hairs bristled He prostrated  
 himself before God and exclaimed with folded hands,  
 15 God, I behold in Thy body all gods and all classes of living beings  
 among whom Brahma himself and He who liveth in Brahma's mind, <sup>455</sup>  
 16 and all ṛsis and the splendid <sup>456</sup> snakes I behold Thee everywhere with  
 Thy numberless members and endless forms Thy body is formed by  
 all beings and it shows neither end nor beginning nor middle, for Thou  
 17 art unending Thou art a mass of tejas which is of immeasurable  
 18 splendour Thou art the supreme Aksara, <sup>457</sup> the chief foundation of all  
 In Thine avataras, one of which is this present incarnation, Thou art  
 19 the protector of the everlasting Vedic dharma I know Thee to be the  
 eternal Personality <sup>458</sup> Thou art without beginning, middle and end,  
 and Thou art a treasury of boundless knowledge, power, force, domi-

<sup>454</sup> R refers to G 10.8 10.19 31, 10.32

<sup>455</sup> *Isam kamalāsanaṣṭham* BhG = R *Kamalāsane Brahmanī sthītam* *Qsaṃ*  
*tanmano vasthītam* Gov obviously translates the variant reading *tanmate* 'va-  
*sthitam* and takes *isa-* as Śiva's well known name 'who is seated in Brahma',  
 meaning that Śiva is under the control of (his father) Brahma in that case  
 however R, who speaks nowhere of the supreme Deity of Caivism would cer-  
 tainly have specified *isa* by *Śiva* or *Rudra* it seems more likely that accepting  
 the reading of the text, with *isa* Sanaka is meant the first of the mind born  
 sons of Brahma who play a role in Pāñcarātra Cosmogony Padmanabha >  
 Brahma Kamalāsana > Sanaka etc (Otto Schrader, Introduction to the Pāñ-  
 carātra)

<sup>456</sup> *divyān* G = R. *dīptān* cf n 453

<sup>457</sup> R refers to MundUp 1.14 where *akṣara-* occurs in the sense of the  
 Supreme Being and the terminology (*dīe vede vedītar, etc*) recalls that of the Gita

<sup>458</sup> R quotes ÇvetUp 3.8 and MundUp 3.28 where *puruṣa* has the sense of  
 Supreme Being

nion and tejas.<sup>459</sup> Innumerable are Thine arms, feet, bellies etc. All Thine eyes are serene like the moon and glaring like the sun.<sup>460</sup> Thou dost govern the universe by Thy tejas. Thou dost pervade all worlds, high and low, and the space in which they are situated. When beholding Thy marvelous awe-inspiring form the three worlds are appalled, mahātman!<sup>461</sup> Yonder hosts of divinities approach Thee, at beholding Thee who art the foundation of all. Some of them are awed and praise Thee according to their knowledge. Others, maharṣis and siddhas, glorify Thee as the venerable Lord with befitting hymns. Rudras, ādityas etc., and pitaras<sup>462</sup> do now behold Thee and they are stricken with amazement.

### 13. Arjuna's terror.

Now, while beholding Thine exceedingly terrifying form all three worlds and I, myself are panic-stricken. While I behold Thee touching the Supreme Heaven,<sup>463</sup> glaring, multicoloured, with yawning mouth and wide, fiery eyes, my heart is terrified and I am unable to find support for my body or rest for my mind and senses; O Pervader!<sup>464</sup> Looking at Thy horrid faces which are operant in destroying everything like the Fire of Time at the end of the yuga, I am led astray and find no happiness. Overlord of all lords, of Brahmā himself, and all others, do show me Thy favour and restore my old self!<sup>465</sup>

<sup>459</sup> R. takes *virya-* in *anantavīryam* to imply all 5 beautiful qualities.

<sup>460</sup> R.: when regarding the gods and the demons respectively, this in reference to 11,36.

<sup>461</sup> mahātman G. = R. *aparicchadamanovṛtte* "Thou, the radius of whose mind has no limits"; ātman- = *manas-*; the second half of st. 20 is made to explain why Arjuna has been granted divine vision, for, without it he would have been appalled like the three worlds.

<sup>462</sup> So R. explains *uṣṇas* referring to TaittBr. 1,10 *uṣṇabhāgāḥ hi pitaraḥ*.

<sup>463</sup> R. explains that this *nabhas-* is the Supreme Heaven (*Vaikunṭha-*), which is beyond prakṛti (as appears from MahānārUp. 1; CvetUp. 3,8; TaittS. 2,2,12,5), from the fact that *nabhaspṛśam* is attributed to the One who is the substratum (*āśraya-*) of all, prakṛti and puruṣa in whatever form or condition (and therefore cannot be prakṛti or embodied, ātman) and that the space in between earth and heaven is pervaded by God (supra, st. 20) so that with *nabhas-* another kind of heaven must be meant.

<sup>464</sup> *Viṣṇo* G. = R. *vyaṣṇin* (from *√viś* "enter"), God pervading the entire universe.

<sup>465</sup> R.: in the foregoing (st. 9-25) God has revealed by showing all existence and activity to be dependent on him that He has descended into human shape in order to rule the earth and destroy Dhṛtarāṣṭra's men as well as demoniac elements in Yudhiṣṭhira's ranks (this to account for the slaying of some of Yudh.'s men in spite of Kṛṣṇa's alliance); st. 26-31 Arjuna perceives this asks the reason for this gruesome manifestation.

- 26—27 All the sons of Dhṛtarāṣṭra and the sūta's son Karna are, together with their partisans and even some chief warriors of our army, entering Thy terrifying mouth to be destroyed: they hasten to their end of their own accord. Thou hast revealed this appalling form to me when I besought thee to show Thine eternal ātman so that I could cognize Thine unlimited dominion. But who art Thou who hast such a horrible form? To what end does it serve Thee? Be gracious to me and tell me the reason why Thou hast revealed this form of destroyer and tell me what actions Thou proposest to perform in this form.
- 28—31

4 *The meaning of God's terrible aspect.*

- 32 Quoth God, While calculating<sup>466</sup> the end of the lives of all beings, among whom Dhṛtarāṣṭra's warriors are the first, I appear in this horrible shape which causes their destruction, in order to annihilate these beings. Therefore, even if thou, O Arjuna, refusest the help of
- 33 thine energy, the hostile warriors will of a certainty be destroyed; so rise to fight them and do by defeating them obtain the fame of victory and enjoy righteous kingship. I am the One who doom those who have sinned: thou<sup>467</sup> art but the instrument by which I have chosen to kill
- 34 them. Slay Drona, Bhīma, Karna etc whom I have doomed because of their sins, and do not suffer thine anxiety about dharma and adharma and thy love and compassion for thy relatives<sup>468</sup> to worry thee. I have doomed them because they are sinners; do therefore not hesitate and fight them, for thou shalt defeat thy rivals. No cruelty is to be found at all in this battle: on the contrary, thou shalt win the victory.

5. *Arjuna's exaltation.*

- 35 Then, Saṃjaya proceeds, Arjuna was over-awed and prostrating himself before God he exclaimed,
- 36 Justly does this universe of gods, gandharvas and the like which has foregathered to see the battle and has by Thy divine Grace beheld Thee now, delight in Thee, love Thee and glorify Thee; and justly do the rākṣasas run away in terror, and justly do all siddhas pay homage to Thee! Why indeed should Hiranyagarbha and all others not pay homage to Thee who art superior to them and art the creator even of

<sup>466</sup> *kalayati, gaṇayati* *kālah*, *kāla*- being interpreted as "Death".

<sup>467</sup> *saca samādhaye* "√sac- in the sense of 'connecting, fastening'", so *sarjya-dācin*- "who is capable of fastening the strings to the bow with his left hand, ambidextrous".

<sup>468</sup> cf. 1.26-27 and GAS. 5.

Brahmā Hiraṇyagarbhā? Thou art, the jīvatman,<sup>469</sup> Thou art the prakṛti, whether existing as cause or as effect,<sup>470</sup> and Thou art the released ātman.<sup>471</sup> Therefore Thou art the primeval God, the Person, 38  
the ancient One Thou art, the supreme foundation, for Thou art the ātman of all, and sundry beings which constitute Thy body. Thou art all knowledge and all that can be known, so Thou art the highest end 39  
Thou dost pervade the entire universe consisting of cit and acit. Thou art to be called by the names of everyone, and everything because Thou 40  
art their ātman. Thy valour is boundless!

*Question* Being ignorant of Thy qualities and urged upon by perplexity and life-long familiarity, I have always considered Thee my equal and friend. So I came to address Thee simply as Kṛṣṇa, or Yadu's son, or friend, and in jest I have not shown Thee the reverence that is due to Thee. For all this I beseech Thy forgiveness. Thou art father 43-  
and guru of this world, and therefore Thou art most venerable. No one in the entire universe equals Thee, how then could one surpass Thee? Thus, most venerable Lord, I prostrate myself before Thee and implore Thy mercy. Just as a father or a friend, when fittingly entreated, will show mercy to his son or his friend if he have been at fault, so, most compassionate Lord, abide me in all things, like a lover abides his beloved. Having seen Thy most marvelous and awe inspiring form,<sup>472</sup> 45-  
I am transported by love and my mind is panic stricken. So reveal to me Thy first, most gracious form, Lord of the gods!

*Answer* Quoth God, Herewith I have revealed to thee My majestic 47  
form, which no one before thee has ever beheld, because thou art my devotee. I could do so because it is in My nature that all that I will comes true.<sup>473</sup> In this form, in which I exist just as I am, I am visible 48  
but to one who has perfect and complete bhakti toward Me, not to one who merely follows the Veda, performs sacrifices etc. Thy terror and 49  
bewilderment caused by My terrifying form which thou hast seen may cease now, for I show thee the benign shape to which thou wert accustomed before. Look at it!

<sup>469</sup> *akṣaram* G = R *jīvātmataṭtvam* R. refers to KaiṣUp. 2,18 na mṛiyate etc., which proves that the ātman does not perish (*na kṣarati*)

<sup>470</sup> R. explains *sadasat* as the principle (*tattva*) of prakṛti existing either as effect (*sat* being diversified by names and forms) or as cause (*asat* not being so diversified)

<sup>471</sup> G *taṭparam*, viz beyond prakṛti and jīvatman.

<sup>472</sup> *dhāma* G = R. *sthānam prāpṣasthānam* iti

<sup>473</sup> R. s paraphrasis of *adṛṣṭapūrṇam*.

<sup>474</sup> *ātmayogāt* G = R. *ātmānaḥ satyaśaṃkalpayogayuktatāt*

- 26—27 All the sons of Dhṛtarāṣṭra and the sūta's son Karna are, together with their partisans and even some chief warriors of our army, entering Thy terrifying mouth to be destroyed: they hasten to their end of their own accord. Thou hast revealed this appalling form to me when I besought thee to show Thine eternal ātman so that I could cognize Thine unlimited dominion. But who art Thou who hast such a horrible form? To what end does it serve Thee? Be gracious to me and tell me the reason why Thou hast revealed this form of destroyer and tell me what actions Thou proposest to perform in this form.
- 28—31

4 *The meaning of God's terrible aspect.*

- 32 Quoth God, While calculating<sup>466</sup> the end of the lives of all beings, among whom Dhṛtarāṣṭra's warriors are the first, I appear in this horrible shape which causes their destruction, in order to annihilate these beings. Therefore, even if thou, O Arjuna, refusest the help of
- 33 thine energy, the hostile warriors will of a certainty be destroyed; so rise to fight them and do by defeating them obtain the fame of victory and enjoy righteous kingship. I am the One who doom those who have sinned: thou<sup>467</sup> art but the instrument by which I have chosen to kill
- 34 them. Slay Droṇa, Bhīma, Karṇa etc. whom I have doomed because of their sins, and do not suffer thine anxiety about dharma and adharma and thy love and compassion for thy relatives<sup>468</sup> to worry thee. I have doomed them because they are sinners; do therefore not hesitate and fight them, for thou shalt defeat thy rivals. No cruelty is to be found at all in this battle: on the contrary, thou shalt win the victory.

5. *Arjuna's exaltation*

- 35 Then, Samjaya proceeds, Arjuna was over-awed and prostrating himself before God he exclaimed,
- 36 Justly does this universe of gods, gandharvas and the like which has foregathered to see the battle and has by Thy divine Grace beheld Thee now, delight in Thee, love Thee and glorify Thee; and justly do the rākṣasas run away in terror, and justly do all siddhas pay homage to Thee! Why indeed should Hiranyagarbha and all others not pay homage to Thee who art superior to them and art the creator even of
- 37

<sup>466</sup> *kalayati gaṇayati kālāḥ*, *kāla-* being interpreted as "Death".

<sup>467</sup> *saca śmādaye* "√*sac-* in the sense of 'connecting, fastening'", so *sarja-sacin-* "who is capable of fastening the strings to the bow with his left hand, ambidextrous".

<sup>468</sup> cf. 1,26-27 and GAS. 5.

Brahmā, Hiraṇyagarbha? Thou art the jīvātman,<sup>469</sup> Thou art the prakṛti, whether existing as cause or as effect,<sup>470</sup> and Thou art the released ātman<sup>471</sup> Therefore Thou art the primeval God, the Person, 38  
the ancient One. Thou art the supreme foundation, for Thou art the ātman of all and sundry beings which constitute Thy body. Thou art all knowledge and all that can be known; so Thou art the highest end. Thou dost pervade the entire universe consisting of cit and acit. Thou 39  
art to be called by the names of everyone and everything because Thou art their ātman. Thy valour is boundless! 40

*Question.* Being ignorant of Thy qualities and urged upon by perplexity and life-long familiarity, I have always considered Thee my equal and friend. So I came to address Thee simply as Kṛṣṇa, or Yadu's son, or friend, and in jest I have not shown Thee the reverence that is due to Thee. For all this I beseech Thy forgiveness. Thou art father 41—42  
and guru of this world, and therefore Thou art most venerable. No one in the entire universe equals Thee, how then could one surpass Thee? Thus, most venerable Lord, I prostrate myself before Thee and implore Thy mercy. Just as a father or a friend, when fittingly entreated, will show mercy to his son or his friend if he have been at fault, so, most compassionate Lord, abide me in all things, like a lover abides his beloved. Having seen Thy most marvelous and awe-inspiring form,<sup>472</sup> 43—44  
I am transported by love and my mind is panic-stricken. So reveal to me Thy first, most gracious form, Lord of the gods!

*Answer.* Quoth God, Herewith I have revealed to thee My majestic 47  
form, which no one before thee has ever beheld, because thou art my devotee. I could do so because it is in My nature that all that I will comes true.<sup>473</sup> In this form, in which I exist just as I am, I am visible 48  
but to one who has perfect and complete bhakti toward Me, not to one who merely follows the Veda, performs sacrifices etc. Thy terror and 49  
bewilderment caused by My terrifying form which thou hast seen may cease now, for I show thee the benign shape to which thou wert accustomed before: look at it!

<sup>469</sup> akṣaram G = R. jīvalmatattvam; R. refers to KathUp. 2.18 na... mṛiyate . etc., which proves that the ātman does not perish (na kṣarati)

<sup>470</sup> R. explains sadasat as the principle (tattva-) of prakṛti existing either as effect (sat, being diversified by names and forms) or as cause (asat not being so diversified).

<sup>471</sup> G' tatparam, viz. beyond prakṛti and jīvātman.

<sup>472</sup> dhṛma G = R. siddham prapyaśānam itī.

<sup>473</sup> R.'s paraphrasis of adṛṣṭapūrṇa.

<sup>474</sup> ātmajogī G = R. ātmamah saṁyasaṁkalpajogayuktatī.

50 Then, Saṁjaya proceeded, God showed Arjuna his familiar four-armed body<sup>475</sup> and reassured him; and Arjuna said,

51 Now I have come to my senses again, now I behold *once more* this lovable beautiful body of Thine, peculiar to none but Thee, which has the generic structure of a common human being and is most benevolent.

6. *Presentation of God's proper form is only possible by bhakti.*

52 God states that the form which Arjuna has witnessed, a moment  
53—54 before cannot be seen by anyone, not even by gods: for it is not through Vedas, sacrifices, charity etc. that God can be seen, for all those are destitute of bhakti. It is only through bhakti that God may be either known by the śāstras, or experienced directly, or approached as He really  
55 is.<sup>476</sup> Only when a man performs all acts — studying Vedas, performing sacrifices etc. —, when all his enterprises serve one purpose: the supreme end: God, when he is God's devotee because he loves God so much that he cannot sustain his ātman unless he glorifies God and therefore performs all acts to one end: God, when he is attached to God alone, when he fosters no hatred for any being because he has no reason to do so since to him all happiness and unhappiness naturally coincide with union with and separation from God and since he realizes that all beings depend on the Supreme Person, — only then he will attain God as He really is, that is, all his defects — ignorance etc. — will vanish and he will cognize God alone.

## VI MISCELLANEOUS

1. *Why it is better to worship God than the ātman.*

12, 1 *Question.* Which group of aspirants will be the first to realize their aspirations, the group of bhaktas who worship<sup>477</sup> God because they believe him to be the supreme Lord and man's, supreme end<sup>478</sup> and possessed of all forms of dominion, or the group of those people who worship the akṣara, i.e. the individual ātman which cannot be grasped<sup>479</sup> by organs such as the eyes etc.?

<sup>475</sup> as Vasudeva's son, R. explains, God has four arms; he refers to YP. 5,3,10; 13; and an unidentified BhāgP. quotation.

<sup>476</sup> R. refers to KathUp. 2,23.

<sup>477</sup> *paryupāsate* paraphrased, by *paripūrnam upāsate* "who adore God in his plenitude" (from *pari-* "completely").

<sup>478</sup> *satataṁ yuktāḥ* explained by R. as *bhagavantaṁ tvāṁ eva param prāpyaṁ manandhā*, from *√yuj-* "to concentrate, reflect"? see also, n. 97.

<sup>479</sup> *avyaktaṁ*.

*Answer.* The group of bhaktas who, out of excessive love, have focused their minds<sup>480</sup> on God and in perfect faith aspire to constant union with God will attain their object — God himself — soon and easily.<sup>481</sup> The second group comprises those who do not worship God but the akṣara, i.e. the individual ātman. This akṣara is different from the body; so it cannot be denoted by the names of god, man etc.;<sup>482</sup> therefore it cannot be grasped by organs such as the eyes etc. Moreover, though it exists in the bodies of all beings, it cannot be thought of as being identical with those bodies, for it is of a different kind; so the akṣara is common to all beings<sup>483</sup> but it is not subjected to development and therefore constant. Those people, then, who have made all their senses cease to operate, who regard all ātmans — however dissimilar the bodies to which they are confined may be — as essentially equal because they all have one and the same form: knowledge, and who therefore rejoice in the well-being of all beings,<sup>484</sup> those people will attain the ātman which is of God's kind, that is, released from saṃsāra.<sup>485</sup> This group of people who focus their minds on the ātman will, however, meet more difficulties in achieving their end than the first group of aspirants, the bhaktas. Only after conquering many great difficulties people who mistake the body for the ātman will acquire the mental focus on the true ātman, whereas God will soon rescue from saṃsāra his faithful devotees who, while focusing their minds on the ātman,<sup>486</sup> dedicate all their profane and sacral acts to God because He is their only end, and who, uniting themselves with none but God, worship him by meditation, prostration, glorification etc., in which they delight.

<sup>480</sup> 'the mind being *prāpyaviṣaya* — "directed toward an end".

<sup>481</sup> So R. shades the meaning of *G. yuktatama*, for these aspirants are superior to those of st. 5 who encounter difficulties, and, as witness st. 7, they will soon (*na cirāt*) reach their end.

<sup>482</sup> = *G. ānūrdeśyam*.

<sup>483</sup> = *G. kṣāstham*; on the synonymity of *kṣāstha* and *akṣara*. R. refers to G. 15, 16-17 *kṣāstho 'kṣara ucyaṭe || uttamaḥ puruṣaḥ tv anyah* and adds that in *akṣaravidyā* (*yayā tad akṣaram adhiḡamyate*, MuṇḍUp. 1.1.5) *akṣara* however denotes the Supreme Brahman, this because It is the womb of all beings (who are *kṣara*) and therefore *a-kṣara* — Itself.

<sup>484</sup> or, as R. adds, ceasing to rejoice in their adversity which results from *abhimāna*; in other words, the joy regards the well-being of these beings as far as they are ātmans; cf. *ātmavat sarveṣāṃ bhātānāṃ hiteṣu niratāḥ* (n. 241).

<sup>485</sup> *mām G.* = R. *matsamānākāram asaṃsāriṇaṃ ātmānam*, the ātman being equal to God inasmuch as it is not subject to karman; R. refers to G. 14.2 (*mama sādharmaṇam*) and MuṇḍUp. 3.1.3 (*nirāśījanaḥ paramaṇ sūnyam upaiti*).

<sup>486</sup> *avyaktā gatīḥ G.* = R. *avyaktaviṣayaḥ manovṛttīḥ*; for *avyakta* is ātman, see above (n. 479).



## 2. How to worship God and when to worship the ātman.

- 8 For these reasons, that God is man's supreme end <sup>487</sup> and that He can be attained very soon and easily, one should focus the mind completely on God and form the conviction <sup>488</sup> that He indeed is the highest attainable end. As soon as one has formed this conviction and consequently focused the mind on God, one will live in God. If one does not immediately succeed in focusing the mind on God completely and constantly, then one should attempt to concentrate on Him by first practising regular representation of him which implies a boundless
- 9 love of him. If one is incapable of that, then urged upon by excessive love for God one should perform devotional acts for the glory of God. Then one will soon be able to practise regular representation of God and consequently focus the mind on him and finally succeed in siddhi
- 10 or the attainment of God. If one does resort to bhaktiyoga <sup>489</sup> but yet is unable to perform even these devotional acts, then one should resort to akṣarayoga <sup>490</sup> and practise the renunciation of the results of one's acts. Then, <sup>491</sup> by disinterestedly performing acts to propitiate God, one will attain the knowledge of the ātman and through this knowledge dispel the darkness of ignorance, contemplate the ātman whose sole essence is to be a śeṣa of God, and acquire the spirit of perfect bhakti
- 11 toward God. <sup>492</sup> More than the practice of regular representation devoid of love, does the knowledge, which causes the ātman to be evident and which presupposes true knowledge of the ātman, favour the well-being of the ātman. Still more than that imperfect knowledge, does the meditation on the ātman favour the well-being of the world of which the former is a means. More than that still imperfect meditation is disinterested activity of which the former is a means. As a direct consequence of this activity all evil is annulled and the mind cleared. When the mind is cleared, perfect meditation on the ātman is possible. <sup>493</sup>

<sup>487</sup> or the variant readings -jñānaprāpyatvād and -jñānārthatvād "because of the fact that he is the end to be reached by supreme knowledge" and "that he is the object of supreme knowledge".

<sup>488</sup> buddhi- taken synonymously with adhyavasāya.

<sup>489</sup> madyogam G. = R. madgūṇānusandhānakṛtamadekapriyatvākāram bhaktiyogam.

<sup>490</sup> akṣarayoga- or ātmayoga-: karmayoga which implies knowledge of the ātman's nature and is propaedeutic to bhakti, see supra 3,0.

<sup>491</sup> for then one has subdued one's mind (yatātmavān G. = R. yatamanaskah).

<sup>492</sup> R. refers to G. 18,46-54 where this sequence of developments is enumerated.

<sup>493</sup> from all this follows, R. remarks, that ātmanīṣṭha (= akṣarayoga-, supra

3. The qualities of one devoted to disinterested activity.<sup>494</sup> ३. एकनिष्ठत्वं

He does not hate any being, even though it hates him.<sup>1</sup> He is friendly to all beings, whether they hate him or help him. He is compassionate toward all beings which love him. He is not possessive and does not suffer from the delusion that his body is the ātman. So he is neither delighted nor vexed when fortune or misfortune befall him, for fortune and misfortune are only imagined. He is not transformed<sup>495</sup> by rivalry and power,<sup>496</sup> even if they are inevitable. He is satisfied with whatever he may happen to find for the sustenance of his body. He is constantly occupied by the thought<sup>497</sup> that the ātman is separated from prakṛti. He has control over the activities of his mind.<sup>498</sup> His conviction as to the matter and purpose which are taught by the doctrine of the ātman is firm. He has focused on God the positive certainty that God is propitiated by disinterested activity and, when duly propitiated, will allow his ātman to be evident. A devotee who, through such karmayoga, practises bhaktiyoga is beloved of God. So is the karmayogin who does nothing to vex the world, who is not vexed by the world because he is not interested in it and who therefore is not joyous, intolerant, fearful and irascible. Beloved of God, too, is he who does not care for anything different from the ātman, whose body prospers on pure nourishment prescribed by the śāstras, who is capable<sup>499</sup> of earning the means to perform śāstric rites, who does not feel pain at disagreeable contacts which are inevitably connected with the performance of śāstric rites and who renounces all activities except those prescribed by the śāstras. Beloved of God is the karmayogin who does not delight in any generally

n. 490) is the best means for him who is incapable of bhaktiyoga, whereas for him who is qualified for *ātmanīyā* but has not yet a pure (*jānta-* "free from attachment to results") mind, *karmaṇīyā* (that is preparatory karmayoga of disinterested activity which does not yet imply knowledge of the ātman) is the best means. The sequence which R. reads in this verse is 1. *dhyanā-* ("wandering of un-focused mind in preparatory karmayoga") 2. *jñāna-* ("karmayoga with implied knowledge of the ātman") 3. *tad-* (sc. *jñāna-*) *āparokṣyam* ("contemplation of the ātman") 4. *bhakti*. It is not clear where *jñānayoga* enters into this sequence.

<sup>494</sup> this is advanced karmayoga which implies knowledge of the ātman, purifies the mind, and is propaedeutic to bhakti.

<sup>495</sup> = G. *kṣamī*.

<sup>496</sup> text *sparsāprabhavayor*, v.l. *spardhā-* which I translate; *prabhava-* is taken synonymously with *prabhāva-* (cf. n. 411) "power".

<sup>497</sup> *satatam yogi*, compare n. 477.

<sup>498</sup> = G. *yaiśtīmā*.

<sup>499</sup> = G. *dakṣaḥ*.

18—19 delightful thing and does not hate any odious thing, who is not grieved by common sorrows, does not desire desirable things and renounces good as well as evil because both cause his bondage. Beloved of God is he who is equanimous, whether he is approached by a friend or by an enemy, who is not attached to his dwelling-place<sup>500</sup> etc., because his mind is constantly focused on the ātman, and is therefore equanimous as to honour and blame

4 *But the bhakta is superior*

20 This teaching of the superiority of bhakti<sup>niṣṭhā</sup> to ātma<sup>niṣṭhā</sup> is now summarized in the statement that those votaries who hail<sup>501</sup> bhakti as being at once righteous and immortal are most dearly beloved of God

<sup>500</sup> = G *aniketaḥ*

<sup>501</sup> R viz. in the manner of 122 where the bhaktas were spoken of.

## PART THREE

### EXPLANATIONS OF TOPICS ALREADY DISCUSSED IN THE PRECEDING PARTS

#### I ATMAN AND BODY

##### 1. *The proper forms of ātman and body.*

This body, though it may be put in *sāmānādhikarānya* with the experiencing-ātman,<sup>502</sup> e.g. in the proposition "I am lean", etc. is different from the latter. Sages who possess exact knowledge of the body call it the experiencing-ātman's field of experience. A person who knows this body and, because of his very knowledge, must be different from his body which is the object of his knowledge,<sup>503</sup> is called a *kṣetra-jña* by these sages. That person may, when perceiving entities different from the body, consider his knowing ātman to be in a relation of *sāmānādhikarānya* to his body, for instance in the proposition: "I who am a man know this jug"; still, when he perceives his body he will know that it is an entity different from his ātman and of the same order as a jug, because being an object of the ātman's knowledge it is of the same order as other objects of knowledge, so that now the proposition runs: "I know his body too, in the same way as I know a jug."

One may conceive the ātman to be in a relation of *sāmānādhikarānya* to the body inasmuch as both are indissolubly connected:<sup>504</sup> for the body serves only to particularize an ātman as belonging to a certain class. In itself the knowing ātman is not accessible to the organs of vision etc., because its form is peculiar to itself alone and accessible only to a mind

<sup>502</sup> *bhoktr-ātman*- "the ātman in relation to the body", in contradistinction to *prāptṛ-ātman*- (supra, 3,0) "the ātman in relation to its pure self, the ātman as the realizer of its own pure form as distinct from *prakṛti*".

<sup>503</sup> supra 2,18.

<sup>504</sup> *apṛthaksiddhi*- "inseparable connection of the attribute with the attributed"

prepared by Yoga.<sup>505</sup> But this does not justify the fools in regarding this knower as the prakṛti, only because it is proximate to prakṛti.<sup>506</sup>

- 2 The kṣetrajña is God, i.e. God is its proper form; the same is true of the kṣetra.<sup>507</sup> As has been pointed out, kṣetra and kṣetrajña may be put in sāmānādhikarāṇya, both being indissolubly connected because the kṣetra particularizes the kṣetrajña. Likewise both kṣetra and kṣetrajña may be put in sāmānādhikarāṇya with God, because it is the sole nature of both to particularize God.<sup>508</sup> Kṣetra and kṣetrajña are merely constitutive of God's body. God is the inner Ruler of all kṣetrajñas and therefore constitutes their ātman;<sup>509</sup> so they may be put in sāmānādhikarāṇya with God.<sup>510</sup> One should know that kṣetra and kṣetrajña are distinguishable and that God is the ātman of both.

There are other interpretations given.<sup>511</sup> It is said that the sentence: "Know that I am also the kṣetrajña" should be understood to express identity, because of the sāmānādhikarāṇya; then it should be admitted that God becomes as it were the kṣetrajña in consequence of Nescience of the truth, and that it is just this Nescience which this teaching seeks to sublimate. It should be compared to the information of a reliable man that there is no snake where a snake is imagined, but only a rope: this information sublimes the erroneous notion that there is a snake.<sup>1</sup> So in the same manner the teaching of the Lord, who is most reliable, sublimes the erroneous notion that there is a kṣetrajña.

But then I would ask: As to this teacher, the venerable Vāsudeva, the Supreme Lord, has his Nescience been sublated by the exact knowledge of the ātman or has it not? If the answer be: Yes, his Nescience has been sublated, then I argue: In that case the view, held by Arjuna and others, that there is Difference, is impossible and so is any attempt to teach them, because it is impossible to attribute to the ātman — which in your opinion is mere undifferentiated Consciousness —

<sup>505</sup> on Yoga see Lecture 6.

<sup>506</sup> R. refers to G 15,10 *utkrāmantam sthitam vāpi bhuñjānam vā gundh-vitam / vīmūḍhā nānupaśyanti paśyanti jñānacakṣuṣaḥ*.

<sup>507</sup> because of G. *api* "I am the kṣetrajña as well (as the kṣetra)".

<sup>508</sup> R: that God is different from both kṣetra and kṣetrajña appears from 15,16-18

<sup>509</sup> R. refers to Antaryāmibrahmana BĀU. 3,7, esp. 22 (M.).

<sup>510</sup> R refers to Lecture 10 where God stated that He is the ātman of all beings (st 20: *aḥam ātmā... sarvabhūtāśayasthitah* and st. 39 *na tad asti viṇḍyat ṛyān mayā bhūtaṃ carācaram* and st. 42 *viṣṭabhyaḥ aham idaṃ kṛtsnam ekāṅśena sthito jagat*) and in between (st. 21-38) referred to himself in sāmānādhikarāṇya with all possible beings.

<sup>511</sup> by Çankara, GBh. 13,2.

a quality that is foreign to it. — If, however, the answer be: No, his Nescience has not been sublated, then it is utterly impossible that the Lord could even begin teaching the knowledge of the ātman, because He possesses no such knowledge himself.<sup>512</sup>

These and similar views are not to be taken seriously. The people who set them forth have no knowledge and contradict śruti, smṛti etc. The truth is this: the śruti<sup>513</sup> asserts that non-spiritual substance, spiritual substance and the Supreme Brahman are distinct from one another and stand in the relation of Object, Subject and Lord respectively. The Gītā<sup>514</sup> itself states explicitly that God by his own will creates cit and acit conjointly and that from that conjunction all beings arise. Elsewhere the śruti<sup>515</sup> asserts that, in whatever condition cit and acit or Subject and Object exist, their existence depends on God, because they constitute his body and are internally ruled by him, and that God is their ātman. This is also the meaning of the śruti<sup>516</sup> which states that God himself is the world — whether as a cause or as an effect —; for cit and acit, which exist as cause or as effect, constitute God's body. So God is effect when both cit and acit substances, which constitute his body, are in their gross, evolved condition, and He is cause, when both are in their subtle, unevolved condition. This means that the effect is identical with the cause and that therefore the effect can be known if the cause is known. And this again proves the position that by knowing one, one will know all.

<sup>517</sup> In the śruti passage: "Lo! I will enter unto the three divinities by way of the living ātman and distinguish name and form,"<sup>517</sup> the three divinities connote the whole mass of acit. So from this passage we know that all distinctions of name and form are brought about by God's entering into acit via the jīvātman whose ātman is God himself. In result all expressive words<sup>518</sup> signify the Supreme Ātman as modified by the jīvātman of the non-spiritual matter. Therefore the sāmānādhī-

<sup>512</sup> the same reasoning ad 2,12

<sup>513</sup> ÇvetUp. 4,9-10; 1,10; 6,9; 6,16; NārUp 11,1; ÇvetUp. 1,9; 6,73; 1,12; 1,6; 4,6; 4,5; MantrUp 1; ÇvetUp. 4,7 are quoted.

<sup>514</sup> 7,4-5; 9,7-8; 9,10; 13,19; 14,3 are quoted; in 14,3 R. takes *brahman-* to mean prakṛti in its subtle form; for this meaning he refers to MuṇḍUp. 1,1,9 *tasminād itad brahmā nāmarūpam annam ca jāyate*.

<sup>515</sup> R. quotes BĀU. 3,7,3-22 (M); SubālUp. 7 (where *mṛtyu-* means "the subtle prakṛti", < *tamas* in the same sense o.c. st. 2); TaittĀr. 3,11,1.

<sup>516</sup> ChUp. 6,2,1; 6,2,3-6, 8,6, TaittĀr. 2,6,2-3.

<sup>517</sup> ChUp. 6,3,2; R. cites further TaittĀr. 2,6,2.

<sup>518</sup> *sarve vācakaḥ śabdāḥ*; on *vācaka-* see Renou, Terminologie sub *vāc*.

karāṇa of a word denoting an effect with a word denoting the Supreme Ātman as cause, is used in its primary sense.

The upshot of all this is that Brahman is the material cause of the world,<sup>519</sup> because Brahman, if modified by gross and subtle cit and acit, is effect and cause respectively. Nonetheless it is clear that the natures of cit and acit on the one hand and the nature of Brahman on the other are not amalgamated only because Brahman is the material cause of the conjoined cit and acit. For example: the material cause of a coloured cloth is a combination of white, black and red threads. The effected cloth will show a combination of whiteness, blackness and redness where white, black and red threads have been woven in it; but the colours will nowhere have mixed in the effected cloth, no more than they had mixed in the threads which were the cause of the cloth. Similarly, although a combination of God, cit and acit constitutes the material cause of the world, still in the effected world the respective qualities of God as the Ruler, cit as the Subject and acit as the Object of experience are not confused.<sup>520</sup>

From all this it will be clear that the Supreme Brahman, though entering the effect, is not transformed thereby, because his proper form does not change. The fact that He exists at all as the ātman of cit and acit substances in gross condition and divided according to their individual distinctions of name-and-form, proves once more that He is effect, for being an effect is: entering into another mode of existence.

The doctrine that the Supreme Brahman is without qualities<sup>521</sup> is true as far as it means that He is without all evil qualities, as the śruti clearly asserts.<sup>522</sup> The doctrine that knowledge is the essence of the Supreme Brahman is undeniably true if that be understood in the sense that the essence of Brahman, who is omniscient and omnipotent, can only be reflected upon through knowledge and that this essence is knowledge inasmuch as He is self-illuminating.<sup>523</sup>

<sup>519</sup> *brahmopādānaṃ jagat*, that is: Brahman constituting 'a whole' with cit and acit in unevolved condition.

<sup>520</sup> R. adds that this comparison holds only to some extent: for whereas the threads have a separate existence, and, if combined by the will of a person into a cloth, constitute at once cause and effect, cit and acit have no separate existence and therefore God, modified by cit and acit, constitutes at once cause and effect himself.

<sup>521</sup> doctrine of advaitavāda, refuted in detail in *CBh.* 1,1,1 (Th. p. 78 ff.).

<sup>522</sup> R. quotes *ChUp.* 8,1,5.

<sup>523</sup> to prove that Brahman is knower and essentially knowledge R. refers to *MuṇḍUp.* 2,2,7.

The view that the plurality of things is unreal since they cannot be ensouled by Brahman because all plurality is essentially foreign to Brahman, is contradicted by several śrutis<sup>524</sup> which affirm that Brahman does exist by his own will in a plurality of modes because his being is constituted by the plural and manifold moving and immovable entities. This affirmation that Brahman is by his own will modified by manifold entities because He is the experiencer in all kinds of manifold forms, is certainly not contradicted by other śrutis which point to unity.<sup>525</sup>

[This detailed exposition may suffice to show that there is no room for the view that Brahman is nescient, nor for the view that difference in Brahman is due to upādhis. By the śrutis themselves one can know that there is no contradiction between all śrutis which, in the aforesaid manner, assert that essence and nature of God, cit and acit are different, that they are at once cause and effect, and that cause and effect are eternal.

## 32. The body.

Presently it will be summarily explained what a kṣetra is, which elements depend on it,<sup>526</sup> to what transformations it is subject, to what end it has originated<sup>527</sup> and what is its proper form; and what is the proper form of the kṣetrajña and what powers it possesses. The ṛṣis, Parāśara etc.,<sup>528</sup> have worded this knowledge of kṣetra and kṣetrajña in many ways. Moreover they state that Vāsudeva constitutes the ātman of the distinct kṣetra and kṣetrajña.<sup>529</sup> Many passages in the three Vedas<sup>530</sup> affirm very lucidly that kṣetra and kṣetrajña exist separately and that Brahman is the ātman of both. The Brahmasūtras, too, deal with this subject and their arguments carry conviction.<sup>531</sup> This same knowledge of kṣetra and kṣetrajña will now be briefly explained by God.

The kṣetra depends on the great elements — earth, water, fire, 5

<sup>524</sup> TaittĀr. 2,6,2; ChUp. 6,2,3; BĀU. 3,4,7; 6,5,6; 7; 11.

<sup>525</sup> BĀU. 4,4,19; 6,5,15.

<sup>526</sup> yādṛk G. = R. yeṣām āśrayabhātam.

<sup>527</sup> = G. yatprabhāvaḥ: yat = yato hetoḥ, so yasmāi prayojanāya.

<sup>528</sup> R. quotes VP. 2,13, 64-66ab; 84; 96cd-98.

<sup>529</sup> MBh. 13,159,137.

<sup>530</sup> expl. of G. chandobhir vividhāḥ.

<sup>531</sup> G. vinīcīta- explained by "resulting in positive knowledge"; the VS. passages are 1. on kṣetra; 2,3,1-18; 2. on kṣetrajña; 2,3,19-39; 3. on God's being the ātman of cit and acit inasmuch as he actuates them; 2,3,40.



wind, ether —, Ahaṁkāra as the primeval element,<sup>532</sup> Mahat<sup>532</sup> and Prakṛti;<sup>533</sup> on the ksetra depend the tattvas, i.e. the 5 sensoreal senses, 5 motorial senses, the co-ordinating manas, and the 5 objects of the senses; Desire and hatred, happiness and unhappiness, are the effects or the transformations of the ksetra. They are dharmas of the puruṣa,<sup>534</sup> yet they are transformations of the ksetra because they originate from the conjunction of ātman and ksetra and are therefore effectuated by the ksetra. The combination of these various elements is brought about by the cetana on which they ultimately depend.<sup>535</sup> Summing up, the ksetra consists of substance, constitutes the basis of the senses, exists as a combination of elements subject to the transformations desire, hatred, happiness and unhappiness, and serves to be the substratum of the cetana's experience of happiness and unhappiness.

7 The qualities which one should possess in order to be able to know the ātman in the effects of ksetra are the following: humility, sincerity, 8 inoffensiveness, patience, uprightness, attachment to one's guru, purity, 9 detachment; impatience with regard to objects, discrimination between 10 ātman and non-ātman, sense of the deficiency of bodily existence; dis- 11 passionateness, equanimity; constant bhakti in solitude, dependence on the knowledge of the ātman,<sup>536</sup> and fixation on this knowledge. These qualities assist a person who is conjoined with prakṛti in knowing the ātman; all other qualities lead to ignorance, because they are incompatible with the knowledge of the ātman.

### 3. The Ksetrajña.<sup>537</sup>

12 The proper form of the individual ātman will now be explained; by virtue of this knowledge — which is attainable with the assistance of the above qualities — one will reach the pure ātman, the ātman exempt from the dharmas of prakṛti like birth, old age, death etc.

The individual ātman is beginningless and endless;<sup>538</sup> it is subject

<sup>532</sup> = G *buddhi*-, not to be confounded with *buddhi*- as a psychological function, supra 2,41

<sup>533</sup> G *avyakta*-, not to be confounded with *avyakta*- = ātman-.

<sup>534</sup> R refers to G 13,20

<sup>535</sup> R reads *saṁghātaś cetanādhyātmiḥ*, the latter word being a bahuvrīhi adjectival to the former.

<sup>536</sup> *adhyātma-jñānamityatram* G. = R *-niṣṭhatvam*

<sup>537</sup> R = that principle which knows, the ksetra as said above (st. 1): *etad* (sc. *kṣetram*) *yo veti*...

<sup>538</sup> KathUp 2,18 is quoted, R. reads *anādi matparam*.

to God, of whom it is a *śeṣa*,<sup>539</sup> it is a quantity<sup>540</sup> of the category *ksetrajña*, distinguishable from and not circumscribable by the body<sup>541</sup> It cannot be called *śat* or *asat*, because it is neither effect nor cause<sup>542</sup> The *atman*'s conjunction with the conditions of effect and cause results, not from its proper form, but from its concealment by ignorance or *karman*, *ksetra* and *ksetrajña* conjoined may be called cause,<sup>543</sup> but not the pure *ksetrajña* alone, because the condition of cause results from *karman*<sup>544</sup> The *atman* in its pure form is able to perform the tasks of hands and feet, of eyes etc, completely,<sup>545</sup> it is present in everything because it cannot be determined by space etc It is capable of knowing the objects with and without the functioning of the senses, it is detached from all bodies, yet it can support all bodies It is by nature exempt from the *gunas* *sattva* etc, yet it is capable of experiencing the *gunas* It can abandon the elements completely and exist without a body, and it can exist within a body In the spontaneous operations of the body it is at once unmoving, because of its own stable nature, and moving, because it is in a body Though existing in the *ksetra*, it cannot be comprehended by the *samsarins* because its uncommon subtlety sets it apart from the body Though present in the body, it is distant from those who are devoid of the above qualities,<sup>547</sup> and near to those who possess them Though present in all beings, the *atman* is undivided because its only form is being a knower, to those, however, who do not know this form, it appears to be distributed over all shapes of beings divine human etc

It has already been pointed out<sup>548</sup> that the *atman* can be known

<sup>539</sup> = G <sup>1</sup> *śatpara* : that God is superior to the *atman* is proved by 12 for the *atman* as a *śeṣa* of God R cites BĀU 3722 (M) ÇvetUp 69 616

<sup>540</sup> *brahman* G = R *bṛhattvagunayogi ksetrajñatattvam* for *brahman* *bṛhant* cf CBh 1414 (Th p 385) see Gonda *Brahman* (passim) for the sense *br* = *atman* R refers to 1426-27 and 1854 see also Intr

<sup>541</sup> R refers to ÇvetUp 59 *sa cānantyāya kalpate* he adds that the *atman* is circumscribable in so far as it is subject to *karman*

<sup>542</sup> R *śat* = effect for an entity is called *śat* in the condition of effect when it has the form of god man etc but it is *asat* or cause if it is not an effect he refers to TaittAr 871 *asad vā idam agra āsit | tato vai sad apyāste*

<sup>543</sup> that is when in subtle condition in which they constitute Br's body

<sup>544</sup> i.e. the *atman* can be called cause in the above sense if conjoined with *prakṛti*

<sup>545</sup> R quotes ÇvetUp 319 which refers to the Supreme Brahman but acc. to MundUp 318 and ChUp 7,26,2 the ind *atman* is similar to the Supreme Br, so that the same holds good for the *atman*

<sup>546</sup> R such as e.g. those enumerated in ChUp 7,12,3

<sup>547</sup> humility etc above 717

<sup>548</sup> ad II 2

as being different from the body because it knows the body; now it is said that the same can be known on other grounds. Because it supports the elements combined in the shape of the body, it can be known as being different from the elements supported. Because it annihilates and originates food etc., which is constituted by elements, it can be known as different from these elements.

- 17 Knowledge, the light of the ātman,<sup>549</sup> illuminates even luminaries — such as the sun, a lamp etc. — which dispel only that darkness which hinders the contacts of senses with objects. It is beyond prakṛti.<sup>550</sup> Therefore the ātman can be known as knowledge, because it has but one form: knowledge, and is attainable by the above means to knowledge. When a devotee of God has acquired this knowledge of the kṣetra and the knowledge of the means leading to the attainment of the ātman in its proper form, distinct from the kṣetra,<sup>551</sup> he is qualified to reach that state in which he is released from saṃsāra.<sup>552</sup>

#### 4. The natural conjunction of ātman with prakṛti.

- 19 Prakṛti and puruṣa, and the conjunction of both, have no beginning. The transformations of the prakṛti, desire, hatred etc., which cause a person to be tied to saṃsāra, and the qualities of humility etc., which cause him to be released, originate from prakṛti. So the beginningless prakṛti conjoined with the ātman and developed into kṣetra is, through its own transformations and its own qualities, the cause, alike of a person's bondage and of his release.

- 20 The activities of body and organs<sup>553</sup> — which are activities in experiencing — depend on the prakṛti developed into kṣetra. This prakṛti is subservient to the person or puruṣa who is the agent, as stated in the Sūtras.<sup>554</sup> This agency of the puruṣa means that the puruṣa is the cause and initiator of all activities to which the subservient prakṛti is instrumental. So all experience of happiness and unhappiness depends on the puruṣa conjoined with prakṛti. The puruṣa itself finds no happiness except in self-experience. When however the puruṣa is conjoined

<sup>549</sup> G. *jyotiḥ* equated with "knowledge", for *ātmaprabhārāpaṃ jñānam*.

<sup>550</sup> = G. *tamas*; cf. *tamas* in *SubālUp. 2*, which R. always explains by prakṛti (e.g. *supra n. 15*).

<sup>551</sup> R. *kṣetra* is treated of in 5-6; the means of knowledge in 7-11; the knowledge of *kṣetrajñā* in 12-18.

<sup>552</sup> = G. *madbhāvāya*, the ātman being similar to God in so far as it is not essentially subject to *karman*.

<sup>553</sup> = G. *kārjā-* and *kāraṇa-* resp.

<sup>554</sup> VS. 2,3,33.

with prakṛti, it has experiences of happiness, unhappiness etc., which are conditioned by its conjunction with prakṛti and effectuated by the guṇas sattva etc

The puruṣa, existing in a particular shape and nature — divine, human etc — which is a result of previous developments of prakṛti, is attached to happiness etc which consist of the guṇas and are proper to that particular nature, and is active in performing the good and evil acts leading to that happiness etc. In order to experience the results of his acts he is born in a certain nature, good or evil, this new existence induces him again to be active and consequently to be born again in saṃsāra, until he cultivates the qualities of humility etc by which he may attain the ātman 21

The puruṣa, when existing in such a body and conniving at its activities, looks on and consents, therefore it is the lord of the body. In the same way it experiences the happiness and unhappiness resulting from the body's activities. So because it rules, supports and exceeds<sup>555</sup> the body, it is a sovereign lord as compared to its body, senses and mind. Likewise it is called the body's sovereign ātman, — sovereign as compared to the body —, and a most sublime puruṣa, i.e. a puruṣa whose knowledge and power are not to be circumscribed by the body, as has been said above<sup>556</sup>. Nevertheless, so long as it is attached to guṇas, the puruṣa is sovereign only as compared with the servile body 22

He who knows that the puruṣa and the prakṛti have the aforesaid natures and who knows the nature of the guṇas — which is still left to explain —, he knows discriminately. He will not be reborn conjointly with prakṛti but attain the purified ātman characterized by non-circumscribable knowledge as soon as he dies 23

Of those who possess this knowledge there are several categories 24  
 1 the bhaktas with perfect yoga who contemplate with their minds the ātman in their bodies,<sup>557</sup> 2 the jñānayogins with imperfect yoga, who contemplate the ātman when they have qualified their minds for yoga,<sup>558</sup> 3 the karmayogins, — a unqualified to practise jñānayoga, b preferring an easier method, c compelled by their authoritativeness to practise karmayoga and who contemplate the ātman, being qualified for yoga by karmayoga which implies jñānayoga, 4 karmayogins who are 25

<sup>555</sup> *seṣitvena* having the body as seṣa subservient instrument  
<sup>556</sup> st 12

<sup>557</sup> *dhyānena* G = R *bhaktiyogena ātmani ātmānam = sarvasthūlam ātmanam ātmanā = manasā*

<sup>558</sup> R *sāṃkhyayoga = jñānayoga* (cf *sāṃkhya* supra 2,39)

not qualified for any of the methods but listen to sages who know the truth and then worship the atman through acts they too will contemplate the atman and conquer death, 5 the traditionalists<sup>559</sup> who are unable to do more than listen to the sages these will contemplate the atman when they are purified of evil and practise karmayoga etc

- 26 When a being is born with a moving or an immovable ātman, then he is born from an interdependent combination of ksetra and ksetrajña,  
 27 composite, never apart He who perceives that the ātmans in all composite beings of all dissimilar shapes are equal because they always have one and the same form knowledge, and that they do not perish when the bodies die, has an exact perception of the ātman But a man who looks upon the atmans as unequal, simply because the shapes of the  
 28 beings in which they reside are dissimilar, and as subjected to birth, death etc, is eternally doomed to samsara When a person perceives that the atmans, residing in all bodies and being the *śesins*, supports and rulers of all these bodies are equal because they all have the same form knowledge, then he saves the ātman with his mind<sup>560</sup> from samsara As a result of his perception of the equality of all atmans he will attain the atman in its pure form, without this perception one will implicate one's atman in samsara

- 29 When a person perceives that all acts are performed by the prakṛti, that therefore the atman is non-agent and that the ātman has the form of knowledge, then he perceives that the atman's conjunction with prakṛti its directing capacity and its experience of happiness and unhappiness all result from ignorance — effected by karman —, and then  
 30 he has an exact perception of the atman When a person perceives that all different modes of existence of all beings depend on one principle, prakṛti and not on the ātman, and that the varieties of new beings issuing from these beings again arise from prakṛti, then he will attain the atman in its purest form

- 31 This sublime atman is not perishable like the body, for it has no beginning it does not act and is not bound by the body's modes of existences, because it is free from *gunas*

- 32 *Question* — Granted that the atman does not act because it is free from *gunas* how can it be possible that the atman is not contaminated by the body's modes of existence which accompany the atman eternally?

*Answer* — In this the atman may be compared to space albeit associated with all substances space is too subtle to be contaminated by the modes

<sup>559</sup> = G *śrutiparāyaṇāḥ*

<sup>560</sup> *ātmanā* G = R. *manasā*

of existence of all those substances; likewise, though present in all bodies, the ātman is too subtle to be contaminated by their modes of existence.

The kṣetрин illuminates the entire kṣetra, within and without, by its own light, like the sun illuminates the entire world. And, even as the illuminating sun is totally different from the illuminated world, so the knowing ātman is totally different from his kṣetra. 33

Those who discern the difference between kṣetra and kṣetrajña by means of their knowledge of the existing difference, and who know how <sup>561</sup> they can be released from the prakṛti of the elements, will attain the sovereign, i.e. the released ātman in its purest form. 34

## II THE GUNAS

### 1. The manner in which the guṇas cause the bondage of the ātman.

Now another kind of knowledge will be dealt with, to wit the knowledge of the guṇas. This is the most important knowledge concerning prakṛti and puruṣa. Having acquired this knowledge a man is equal to God and no longer subject to origination and annihilation. 14, 1—

Before the rôle which the guṇas play in the bondage of the ātman is explained, it is said that the conjunction of puruṣa and prakṛti is brought about by God himself. God causes the puruṣa and prakṛti of all substances to be conjoined: He plants the mass of spiritual beings <sup>562</sup> as an embryo in the Mahad Brahma <sup>563</sup> which is the womb of the non-spiritual matter; in other words, God conjoins his spiritual prakṛti, constituted by experiencing puruṣas, with his non-spiritual prakṛti, constituted by the kṣetra of experience. From this conjunction all beings arise: the Mahad Brahma — the non-spiritual prakṛti — is the cause of all these beings. God is the sowing father: He conjoins the spiritual beings with certain modes of existence in keeping with their karman. Now, what is the cause of our repeated births — as a god, a man etc. — in conjunction with acit and in harmony with our previous karman since the beginning of creation? That is the three guṇas which are 3 4 5

<sup>561</sup> R.: *mokṣyate 'neneti mokṣaḥ*, these means being the qualities of humility etc. summed up supra st. 7-11.

<sup>562</sup> or the jīvaḥhūtaprakṛti of 7,5, here, acc. to R., called embryo because it is the seed (*bīja-*) of all beings.

<sup>563</sup> by R. equated with the non-spiritual prakṛti of 7,4, in contrast with the jīvaḥhūta (7,5); in the opposite *mahad* R. reads an indication to this equation, for the non-spiritual prakṛti is the cause of *Mahat*, *Ahaṁkāra* etc.; for Br. = prakṛti R. refers to MuṇḍUp. 1,1,9.

inherent in the prakṛti conjoined being and particularize its nature, and which can only be known through their effects — brightness etc —, which are not apparent in pure prakṛti but are apparent in its transformations, Mahat etc

- The gunas bind the puruṣa, who is conjoined with a body in all its evolutions from the primordial prakṛti but who in itself is not subjected to gunas they bind the puruṣa within the restrictions of his corporeal existence<sup>561</sup> The sattva guna gives rise to light and happiness, for it is immaculate that light is enlightenment on the proper form of things, this guna causes health Sattva causes a man to be attached to happiness and knowledge and binds him in this way Once attached to knowledge and happiness, he will be actively engaged in realizing them by profane and Vedic means, and attach himself to them when realized
- 7 The rajas guna causes sexual desire general ambitiousness and affection for one's nearest<sup>562</sup> So by exciting his desires it binds a dehin to acts These acts may be good or evil and cause him to be born in a nature in which he will experience the good or evil results The tamas guna springs from false knowledge, it binds the dehin through negligence laziness and sleep Summing up, sattva mainly causes an attachment to happiness rajas to activity, and tamas to undutifulness by causing false knowledge

- 10 As has been said above, the gunas inhere in the prakṛti which gradually is developed into a body

*Question* But then, how can they produce effects which contrast to one another?

- Answer* Although all three gunas are inherent in prakṛti conjoined with atman they can, owing to previous karman and different nourishment,<sup>563</sup> predominate over one another Sattva preponderates when rajas and tamas are subdued rajas when sattva and tamas are subdued, and tamas when sattva and rajas are subdued From the effects can be seen which guna actually preponderates When knowledge is effectuated, then rajas preponderates When greed, final as well as aimless activity,<sup>564</sup> sensorial activity<sup>565</sup> and desire are effectuated, then

<sup>561</sup> expl of G a *javam* (essentially) imperishable

<sup>562</sup> resp G *rāga* (R *yoṣitpuruṣaḥ or anyonyasprhā*), *trīṇā* (R *subdādisar-varṣayaspṛhā*) and *sanga* (R *putrādīṣu sambandhiṣu samsleṣaspṛhā* <√*sac* 'cling to')

<sup>563</sup> the influence of nourishment will be dealt with in Lect 17

<sup>564</sup> = G *prāpti* *ārambha* explained as esp 'final energy'

<sup>565</sup> G a *ana* the non ceasing of sensorial activity

rajas preponderates When no true knowledge,<sup>569</sup> no activity, no sense of duty and false knowledge are effectuated, then tamas preponderates When at a man's death sattva preponderates, then he will be reborn in a family<sup>570</sup> of people who have true knowledge of the atman and be qualified to perform acts furthering the true knowledge of the atman When rajas preponderates at his death, he will be reborn in families who act to gain results and be qualified to perform acts leading to results — heaven and the like When tamas preponderates he will be reborn as a brute incapable of aspiring to man's major ends

According to those who know the developments of the gunas a person who has died while sattva preponderated and consequently has been reborn in a family of sages, will — in virtue of his disinterested action — gain more sattva in his next life and live without suffering<sup>571</sup> A person who has died while rajas preponderated will suffer in sam-sara, this suffering consists in endless activities for the sake of results A person who has died while tamas preponderated will suffer from perpetuated ignorance

*Question* To what results does the increase of sattva in subsequent lives lead?

*Answer* When sattva increases, it will produce knowledge, i.e. true evidential knowledge of the atman<sup>572</sup> When rajas increases, then one is engaged for results like heaven etc will increase too When tamas increases, it will produce negligence, consequently incorrect activity, consequently erroneous knowledge which will increase tamas again, and finally no knowledge at all Sattvika persons will gradually rise and attain release Rajasa persons who act for the sake of results and consequently will be reborn to continue acting, will remain in the middle which means general unhappiness because it will lead to ever new births Tamasa persons, stooping down to ever worse acts will gradually go down to the condition of sudra, of animals, insects, vegetables, immovable matter

2 *How people, whose sattva has gradually increased, may rise beyond the gunas*

A man's sattva will increase when he partakes of sattvika nourishment and performs disinterested acts to propitiate God and totally

<sup>569</sup> prakāśa- (in G aprakāśa-) 'enlightenment as above st. 6

<sup>570</sup> G lokān expl by samāhān, hence 'family'

<sup>571</sup> nirmalam G = R. duḥkha-gaṇḍhāra-kṣitam

<sup>572</sup> jñānam G = R. ātma-jñāna-āparokṣa-rūpam.



suppresses his *rajas* and *tamas*. When in this favourable condition he perceives that the *gunas* are the agents of activities<sup>573</sup> corresponding to *gunas* and knows that the *ātman* itself is non-agent, then he will attain the condition of God

- 20 *Question*. What is meant by the 'condition of God'?

*Answer* Cognizance of the immortal *atman*, for a *dehin* who has risen beyond the three *gunas* which arise from *prakṛti* developed into a body, and who perceives that the *ātman* is different from the three *gunas* and has the form of knowledge, will be released from birth, death and old age and cognize the *ātman*

- 21 *Question*. By what signs can a man who has risen beyond the *gunas* be recognized? How is his behaviour — which is a sign to recognize him by — and how his proper form? And how has he risen beyond the *gunas*?

- 22 *Answer* A man has risen beyond the *gunas* when he does not hate the effects of the *gunas*,<sup>574</sup> if they are present in undesirable things, and does not desire them if they are absent from desirable things different from the *ātman*. He takes no part in anything, for he desires

- 23 nothing but to contemplate the *ātman*. He is not disturbed by the *gunas* which may seduce or pester him by desire or hatred. His acts are not dictated by the effects of the *gunas*, for he perceives the *gunas* in their

- 24—25 effects. He is equable in happiness and unhappiness, his love for the *atman* causing his equanimity because these effects are not the *ātman*'s; so a clod, a stone and a piece of gold are the same to him. He does not prefer the desirable to the undesirable. He knows how to discriminate between *prakṛti* and *ātman*,<sup>575</sup> so no blame or praise will impress him because they arise from virtue or lack of virtue which result from the delusion that the *atman* is just a human being. So he is equable when honoured or when blamed, and consequently is indifferent to friends as well as enemies. Thus he renounces all activities resulting from his being a *dehin*.

- 26 How is one to rise beyond the *gunas*? Not merely by realizing the difference between *ātman* and *prakṛti*,<sup>576</sup> for this realization can be sublated by a wrong *vasanā*. Only when a person pays homage to God through perfect *bhaktiyoga*, can he conquer the almost invincible *gunas*

<sup>573</sup> cf supra 3,29

<sup>574</sup> G *prakāśa-*, *prā-rtti* and *moha-* are taken resp as the effects of *sattva*, *rajas* and *tamas* (above st 11, 12 and 13)

<sup>575</sup> expl of G *dhīra-*, from *√dhr-*, cf n 262

<sup>576</sup> as set forth supra st 19

Only then is he qualified for brahman's condition, i.e. can he attain the ātman as it really is, immortal and imperishable,<sup>577</sup> for God is the support of the atman, of the eternal dharma,<sup>578</sup> and of perfect felicity.<sup>579</sup> 27

### III GOD'S SUPERNAL MANIFESTATION

According to the śruti<sup>580</sup> the roots of the asvattha tree, which is eternal, are planted above and its branches reach downward. This asvattha tree is the saṃsāra, beginning with Brahma who resides above the Universe, and ending below in men, cattle etc. living on the earth. It is eternal because its continuous flow cannot be stopped before a perfect knowledge is effected. Again, the leaves of this tree are said to be the Hymns, for the saṃsāra is made to increase by the desiderative acts which are explained by the śrutis<sup>581</sup>. He who knows this saṃsāra to be thus knows the Veda, for the Veda sets forth the means by which the saṃsāra may be stopped: so one's knowledge of the saṃsāra helps the knowledge of the means by which one may overcome the saṃsāra. The downward branches — men etc. — which spring from the previous karman of these men etc., sprout downward again into men etc. and upward into gandharvas, yakṣas, gods etc.,<sup>582</sup> all these beings flourish through the guṇas and their shoots are the objects. The roots of the tree in the world of Brahma ramify in the world of men, according to karman. 15, 1

People in the saṃsāra are unable to see this tree so as it has been described. A man can only perceive this much: that he is a man, son of so-and-so, father of so and so, living in circumstances corresponding to his condition. He does not see that the end of the tree is brought 3

<sup>577</sup> *brahman* (in *brahmabhūṣa* st 26) is synonymous with *brahmano anṛtasādhya*, or the ātman in its pure form whom to reach is the ambition of the kaivalyārthīn.

<sup>578</sup> R. remarks that *dharma* being on a par with *brahmanah* and *sukhasya* (which both are the aspirant's objects), must also be an object to be attained, not merely a means of attaining an object. It is synonymous with *aiśvarya*, the aim of the aiśvaryaṛthīn.

<sup>579</sup> this felicity being the ambition of the third aspirant, the jñānīn, or perfect bhakta. R. connects this line with the passage of *prapatti* (7.14 ff) where it was explicitly stated that the guṇas can only be overcome, and the ātman consequently only attained by *prapatti*, for a discussion of this passage see Ch. IV, p. 25.

<sup>580</sup> expl. of G. *prākṛuḥ*, R. quotes *KaṭhUp* 6.1, *Taittār* 1.2.52.

<sup>581</sup> R. e.g. *ĀpC* 19.163 and *MaitrS* 1.10.1, that the leaves are these śrutis dealing with desiderative acts. R. explains by the fact that like the saṃsāra flourishes through the fulfilment of desires so a tree flourishes through its leaves.

<sup>582</sup> i.e., acc. to the nature of their karman.

- about by detachment from enjoyments which consist of *gunas*, nor that the tree springs from attachment to *gunas*, nor that the tree is founded on ignorance<sup>583</sup> which is the misconception that *atman* is non-*ātman*
- 4 One should cut this deep-rooted *asvattha* down with the sword of detachment forged from perfect knowledge, and then one should find that place from which one will never return

*Question* How does the attachment to experiences which consist of *gunas* — an attachment dating back to beginningless times — cease to exist, and how does the erroneous knowledge the root of this attachment, cease to exist?

- Answer* To sublate this ignorance, one should take refuge<sup>584</sup> in the aforesaid primordial *puruṣa*<sup>585</sup> for He is the creator of everything and this active attachment to experiences which consist of *gunas* has originally arisen from him This attachment is indeed an ancient one, for the ancient aspirants knew it. they took refuge in God and were
- 5 consequently released from their bonds So with people have taken refuge in God, then his grace will facilitate all their activities they will no more be subject to the misconception<sup>586</sup> that *atman* is non-*atman*, they will conquer their attachment, and delight in meditating on the *atman*, their desire for things different from the *atman* will vanish, they will be released from the pair of opposites happiness and unhappiness, and they will know the natures of *atman* and non-*atman* Then they will attain the *atman* such as it is, in its form of unlimited knowledge

- 6 The light of the *atman* cannot be illuminated by sun or moon or fire It is God's supreme light from which one will never return it is God's because it is an *amsa*<sup>587</sup> and a vibhūti of God, and it is supreme because it can illuminate even the sun etc., but cannot be illuminated by them for it is knowledge which illuminates all Yoga kindles the light of knowledge but yoga is impeded by beginningless *karman* That *karman* may, however, be stopped by detachment founded on *prapatti*
- 7 This *atman* an eternal *amsa* of God, will either become a *jīva*

<sup>583</sup> paraphrases resp *G anta*, *ādi* and *sampratīṣṭhā*

<sup>584</sup> R reads *prapadyed* he seems to know the vulgate reading *prapadye jatah*, or at least the v1 *prapadya jatah* the latter of which he comments *prapadye jatah* — if correct — should be interpreted *prapadya jatah* ('in consequence of that (*prapatti*) alone') cf however Intr Ch IV p 26 27 for *ajñānamṛtyādeh* read *nirvṛtaye*

<sup>585</sup> for *ādya* R refers to G 9 10 108 76

<sup>586</sup> *moha* hence the meaning of *amūḍha* below

<sup>587</sup> on *amsa* cf CBh 2 3 42 (Th p 508 ff) and 3,2,26 27 (Th p 618 f), see Gonda Bhakti generally II 603 ff on R p 605 f

bhūta,<sup>588</sup> darkened by ignorance and existing as a living being, and govern the senses and mind of the body, or it will exist in its proper form, released from ignorance in the aforesaid manner. Whatever body<sup>589</sup> the ātman enters and from whatever body it departs, it will always retain those senses with the subtle elements and roam with them like the breeze roams with the odours which it has carried from their original abodes. It will adapt those senses and mind to their natural functioning in objects and thereby experience these objects. 8 9

Those who are perplexed by ignorance do not perceive that the ātman-with-guṇas is conjoined, forms a whole, with human nature etc., which are particular developments of prakṛti consisting of guṇas, nor do they perceive that this ātman is either departing from a certain mass of prakṛti, or existing in it and experiencing the objects, and that his ātman might at some time be different from such a mass — human nature etc. — and have only one form, knowledge. They are unable to perceive this, for they have the misconception that the ātman is akin to that mass to which it is conjoined. Those,<sup>590</sup> however, who know the difference between mass and ātman and so perceive that the ātman, albeit present in all conditions, is different from whatever mass it is conjoined with, have a clear vision of the truth. 10

Karmayogins who practise prapatti will perceive through yoga that the ātman, though existing in the body, is different from it and has a form of its own. But those who exert themselves without prapatti and whose minds are therefore unqualified and incapable of contemplating the ātman<sup>591</sup> do not perceive it. 11

It has been said above<sup>592</sup> that knowledge can illuminate all luminaries, and that the ātman, whether released or existing in a body, is a vibhūti of God. But the light itself of the luminaries, which is a development of prakṛti, is also a vibhūti of God: their light is God's light, for He has granted it to them. The carrying-capacity of the earth, too, comes from God, for He enters into the earth and carries all beings and nourishes them. Likewise, by entering into soma, which consists of the juice of amṛta, He becomes all herbs. By becoming the digestive fire in the bodies of living beings He digests their fourfold 12 13 14

<sup>588</sup> i.e. conjoined with prakṛti- or jīvakāta- see G. 7,6.

<sup>589</sup> read *yac charitram*.

<sup>590</sup> expl. of *jñānacakṣuṣaḥ*.

<sup>591</sup> cf. G. 14, st. 26 and 27.

<sup>592</sup> st. 6-7.

- 15 food,<sup>593</sup> for God rules everything by his own will and He exists as the ātman within all existing beings, in their hearts from which the knowledge, which is the root of activity and inactivity of all beings, springs forth.<sup>594</sup> Therefore, the memory<sup>595</sup> of all beings springs from God, and so does positive knowledge<sup>596</sup> and the sublation of ignorance.<sup>597</sup> And therefore God may be known by all Vedas, although they deal only with divinities like Agni, because God is their ātman and eternal ruler. So God grants the fruit<sup>598</sup> of the Vedas, and He knows the Vedas which expound him in the above manner. This is the only way in which the Vedas can be explained.
- 16 Therefore, one should hear from God what the essential meaning of the Vedas is. There are two puruṣas which are known in the world, kṣara, i.e. all beings created conjoint with aṇi and naturally transient, i.e. the jīvas, and akṣara, i.e. the released ātman in its pure form, no longer conjoined with aṇi, which is kūṭastha or having none of the characteristics of the body which is a development of prakṛti.<sup>599</sup>
- 17 There is, however, a third puruṣa, differing from both the kṣara and the akṣara puruṣas—that is the Supreme Ātman, who pervades and supports the three categories<sup>600</sup> of cetana, conjoined cetana and released cetana, from which He is different, because He is the eternal Lord.
- 18 Inasmuch as God transcends the kṣara puruṣa, he transcends akṣara and released ātman as well. Therefore He is the Supreme Puruṣa or Person, and so He is styled by śruti and smṛti.<sup>601</sup>

<sup>503</sup> R viz *khādyaśālehyapeyātma* : "to be chewed, sucked, licked and drunk

<sup>504</sup> Taṭṭār 3111 BAU 37,3-22 (M) MahanarUp 117, ChUp 8,1,1, VP 11 17 20 and Manu 12 122 are quoted

593 defined *purvānubhātaḥ śāstram anubhavasamskāramātrajam jñānam*

590 defined *mdryaṅga* *āgama* *yoṇa* *zastumiscayah* *mdrya-* 'perception',  
*linga* 'inference', *āgama* 'scriptural authority' the three *pramanas* which R  
recognizes *yoṇa-* in the sense of 'intuitive presentation' is not a separate *prama*  
(Lacombe, ASV p 281), but being memory (*smṛti-*), is implied by perception,  
that here *yoṇa-* is included among the *pramanas* is certainly, as Dasgupta points  
out an anomaly (III, p 214)

387 *G. apohana* either *apānānuyitti-* (<"removal"), or = *āhana-* = "con-  
jectural knowledge" (s v NK)

508 *antakṛt-* G = R *phalakṛt*

<sup>500</sup> R both *kṣara-* and *akṣarapurīṣa-* are generic names, the common characteristic of the former being the common upadhi of conjunction with prakṛti, and of the latter the common upadhi of separateness from prakṛti.

<sup>600</sup> *loka-* in G *lokatrayam* expl by that which is perceived (*lokjate*), so *lokatraya-* means the three categories which are perceived

001 *cedārīṣa alokaṁ loka itī smṛtiḥ* *śaocyate* "loka- means *smṛti-* here because (through *smṛti-*) the purport of the Veda is seen", for *śruti* R quotes ChUp 8,12 3, for *smṛti* VP 5,17,34

He who knows that God is the Supreme Purusa, differing in kind 19  
 from ksara and aksara purusas because his nature is imperishable and  
 because He pervades, supports and rules all beings by nature, knows  
 all that can be known as a means of attaining God He practises bhakti  
 towards God in all the ways <sup>602</sup> which are said to lead to the attainment  
 of God And his knowledge will excite God's love, the love which  
 responds to the knowledge of God and that which responds to all kinds  
 of bhakti towards God Therefore one should cherish this knowledge  
 of God's transcendence over both other purusas

Herewith has God revealed that most mysterious doctrine of his 20  
 transcendence to Arjuna whom He considers to be qualified to hear it  
 because of his purity <sup>603</sup> Through this doctrine, which can be known  
 by the sastras, a man who wishes to attain God may acquire the buddhi  
 thereto and perform all tasks which should be performed

#### IV THE DIVINE AND THE DEMONIC

The beings who are active in this karmayoga are divided into two 16, 6  
 classes, 1 the divine and 2 the demoniac To which class they belong is  
 determined at their very birth by their own karman It has already  
 been explained in detail, to which conduct the divine are born as they  
 submit themselves to God's commandment, they practise karma-, jñāna-  
 and bhaktiyoga in order to be released from their bondage and attain  
 God <sup>604</sup>

##### 1 The Divine

A person belonging to the divine class of beings is free from fear, 1  
 his internal organ is purified of rajas and tamās, he is fixed on the  
 discrimination of the ātman as a principle different from prakṛti, he is  
 generous, performs sacrifices to propitiate God, is fixed on the practice  
 of his Vedic task, being convinced that the entire Veda deals with God  
 and his vibhūti and explains how God should be worshipped, and he  
 performs austerities which favour his capability of acting He is sincere, 2  
 non-violent, tells the truth if the truth is not offensive, is free from  
 anger, renounces property incompatible with the interests of the ātman,

<sup>602</sup> sarvabhāṣena G = R sarvabhāṣanaprakāraṇa

<sup>603</sup> expl of vocative anagha.

<sup>604</sup> so R explains 'loke 'smin karmayoga being the means by which a man,  
 living in the world, can attain release.

- trains his senses to turn away from objects,<sup>605</sup> abstains from hurting speech, is compassionate, does not desire objects, is not harsh but worthy of associating with sādhus, has a sense of shame, and remains unattracted by desirable objects. He resists all attacks of wicked persons,<sup>606</sup> is patient and persevering, and his internal and external organs are pure and qualified to perform their tasks, he does not interfere with the desires of others and he is not over-proud

## 2 The Demoniac

- 4 A person who belongs to the demoniac class of beings because he has been born to infringe God's commandment like the demons do practises dharma for the fame of it, delights in experiencing objects and is consequently unable to discriminate between what ought and what ought not, he is conceited irascible, scandalizes sādhus<sup>607</sup> and is unable to discriminate between higher and lower reality, what ought to be done and what ought not
- 5 The above divine nature of submission to God's commandment leads to release from bondage and to the attainment of God. The demoniac nature of infringing God's commandment leads to bondage and degeneration. Arjuna who was dubious of his own nature, is reassured being the son of Pandu, that leading Vaiṣṇava, he belongs by birth to that class whose nature is divine
- 7 Whereas the Divine are born to practise karma-, jñāna- and bhakti-yoga, the Demoniac are ignorant of the Vedic dharma which leads to prosperity and release<sup>608</sup>. Neither the purity nor the ability required to perform the Vedic acts as prescribed by the Vedas are proper to their nature nor do they practise the twilight ceremonies which bring about this purity. So no auspicious veracity is proper to their nature. Moreover they deny that the world is ensouled by Brahman<sup>609</sup> and that it is ruled by God<sup>610</sup>. They deny that the entire creation can be understood to originate from the association of prakṛti and puruṣa, and so they do not understand it at all and contend that the world is caused by

<sup>605</sup> *sāntiḥ* G = R *indriyāṇāṃ viśvāpṛāṇāṃ virodhasaṁślāṇam*

<sup>606</sup> *tejas-* being 'the power to overcome and rule others' (*parābhūbhavama-sakti*)

<sup>607</sup> = G *pāruṣyam* contrasted to *mārdāyam* in st 2

<sup>608</sup> *prāṇīti-* G = R *abhyudaya* *mṛṣīti* = *mokṣa-*, both are effects of the observance of the Vedic dharma

<sup>609</sup> *satyaṃ* here in its upaṣadic sense (TaittUp 2.1.1) of Brahman = God, *apratīṣṭham* not being founded on Brahman, for which R refers to VP 2.5.27.

<sup>610</sup> = G *antīkṣyam*, R refers to G 10.8

desire. Therefore, by maintaining this contention they do not realize 9  
 that the ātman differs from the body and they lack all discernment  
 because they cannot conceive that the ātman is different from the body  
 inasmuch as the ātman knows the body. Consequently they do much 10  
 harm to everybody; they are born to bring the world to ruin. They  
 resort to a desire which can scarcely be realized, and to realize it they  
 are driven by their ignorance to get money in unlawful ways,<sup>611</sup> and  
 they parade their unorthodox views with arrogance, pride and pre- 11  
 sumption. Although they may die today or tomorrow, they plan projects  
 which extend beyond their limitations and whose materialization will  
 take up all the time before they die, as ordinary persons will. Therefore 12  
 they think that man's supreme end is enjoyment, and they are convinced  
 that no end could be more exalted. Trapped by a hundred hopes and  
 acting upon nothing but desire and anger, they aspire criminally to 13  
 many things in order to enjoy their desires. They are ignorant enough  
 to think that they have obtained all that they possess by their own  
 efforts and not by virtue of an unseen cause,<sup>612</sup> that they have realized 14  
 their ambitions and acquired their money of their own accord, without  
 the assistance of an unseen factor, and that they may do it again. They  
 attribute to themselves the power to slay an enemy, and the bravery 15  
 and perseverance to slay more. They do not allow for an unseen factor  
 that is an invention of stupid weaklings. So by themselves they are  
 independent and lords over others, by themselves they have experience, 16  
 not through an unseen power. Their success is due to themselves,  
 and so are their power, their happiness, their riches, their pedigree. 17  
 Who in the world, they ask, is my equal? In their ignorance they believe  
 that they sacrifice, give and enjoy by themselves, independently of the  
 grace of God. Distracted by all their conceited reflections, ensnared by 18  
 the net of bewilderment and given to the enjoyment of their desires,  
 they die in the middle of it all and fall a prey to hell. They pay homage  
 to themselves, regard themselves as perfect and come to nothing, for  
 intoxicated by their money and their conceit of knowledge and descent  
 they perform sacrifices for the fame of it, and not in the prescribed  
 manner. They support themselves by their egoism, power, pride, desire  
 and anger, and therefore they hate God within their own and others'  
 bodies and try to discover fallacies in the doctrine of God's existence

<sup>611</sup> = *gṛhīṭasādgrāhān*

<sup>612</sup> *adṛṣṭa*, which is the invisible influence exerted by karma on man's destiny.



- 19 by inconclusive sophisms<sup>613</sup> But God hurls these cruel, impure and meanest people into cycles of existence, revolving around birth, old age, death etc., there they will be born in circumstances incompatible with the attainment of God their buddhis will be depraved and cause their gunas to be active in functioning conformably to the circumstances in which they are born So gradually they will fall deeper and deeper, devoid of and never arriving at true knowledge of God, until they reach the nethermost level

### 3 *The cause of the ātman's decline in demoniac nature*

- 21 The demoniac nature — that hell<sup>1</sup> —<sup>614</sup> has a threefold cause which destroys the atman, viz desire, anger and greed Therefore  
22 these three should be renounced When a man is released from these three, which cause erroneous knowledge of God, he will practise all that furthers the interests of the atman His knowledge of God will make him aspire to please God, and so he will reach the uppermost level  
23 Lack of reverence for the sāstras is the main cause of that hell for if a man rejects the sastra called Veda, and the instruction of God called Veda,<sup>615</sup> and acts merely to realize his wishes, following the lead of his ambitiousness, he will never attain any siddhi in the next world, nor will he find any happiness in this world, let alone the attainment of the supreme end

## V ON THE ACTS WHICH ARE ESTABLISHED BY THE ŚĀSTRAS

- 1 *Acts which are not established by the sāstras have not the desired results, for they are of a demoniac character.*

- 17, 1 Arjuna does not know that acts which are not established by the sāstras have no results, and he wants to know the various results — various in so far as effected by the various gunas — which follow acts which are not established by the sastras, but are performed in faith  
*Question* : What is the position of those who neglect the regulations of the sastras but perform sacrifices in faith? Is that position sattva, rajas or tamas?

- 2 *Answer* : Sastric faith is of three kinds, and it is determined by one's own nature one's own preferences which are effectuated by previous

<sup>613</sup> paraphr of G *abhyasūnakāh*

<sup>614</sup> *narakasya* G = R *āsurasvabhāvarūpasya*

<sup>615</sup> *-idhih* G = R *zedākhyaṃ madanusāsanam*

vāsanās.<sup>616</sup> A man has faith in that act for which he has a preference. Faith is the zeal<sup>617</sup> in executing the means to fulfil a desire; so it presupposes confidence. Vāsanā, preference and faith all originate from that particular natural conjunction with prakṛti which corresponds to the properties<sup>618</sup> of the ātman. The factors which condition these properties are the guṇas which inhere in body, senses and internal organ. The guṇas can only be known by their effects, and these effects are the cognitions of body, senses and internal organ conjoined with guṇas. Hence that faith, too, is of three kinds, it is either of a sattva, or a rajas, or a tamas nature.

Everybody's faith corresponds to the guṇa with which his internal organ<sup>619</sup> is conjoined. When a person has a matured faith<sup>620</sup> in auspicious acts — which themselves are the eventual outcome of that faith —, then he will gain the results of these auspicious acts; consequently faith, or zeal, is the first thing required to gain a result.

Those who have a faith of sattva nature sacrifice to the gods; so the faithful zeal in sacrificing to the gods who cause supreme bliss unstained by unhappiness is of sattva nature. Persons of a rajas disposition sacrifice to yakṣas and rāksasas; their faith brings about limited happiness interrupted by unhappiness. The faith of a tamas person brings about an extremely limited happiness which mostly is unhappiness.

However, no happiness at all will result from ritual acts which are not enjoined by the śāstras, because such acts are contrary to God's teaching. Moreover, they do harm to the performers: they who perform ritual acts — tapas etc. — which are enjoined by the śāstras are subject to conceit, ahaṃkāra, desire, hankering and violence, and they torture all embodied beings and the jīvas, which are amśas of God, within their bodies.<sup>621</sup> They are of a demoniac persuasion: for demons

<sup>616</sup> R.: svābhāṭah svāsādhāraṇo bhāvah prācīnāvāsanānimittas tattadruti-  
śeṣah.

<sup>617</sup> tvarā.

<sup>618</sup> dharmāḥ.

<sup>619</sup> sattva- G = R. antahkarana-: sarvasya puruṣasyāntahkaranānurūpa śraddhā bhavati / antahkaranaṃ yadṛīḡaḡunayuktam tadṛīḡayaḡ vaddhā jḡyala ity arthaḡ; acc. to R., the word sattva- or antahkarana- implies here body, sensorial organs etc. as well.

<sup>620</sup> śraddhāmayaḡ G. = R. śraddhāparināmah; the following is R.'s paraphrase of G.

<sup>621</sup> māṃ G. = R. madamśabhūtam jītam.

act contrary to God's commandment Therefore they will find no happiness at all and fall a prey to a multitude of calamities

2 *Acts which are established by the s̥āstras are of three kinds, according to their determining guna*

a *Nourishment*

7 Nourishment <sup>6.22</sup> is of three kinds, as it may be determined by each of the three gunas Consequently the sacrifice is also of three kinds, even as tapas and charity

8 1 Sattva kinds of nourishment please a man whose sattva preponderates These kinds of nourishment increase life and consequently knowledge,<sup>6.3</sup> power and health They increase happiness while developing into fulness and they increase pleasure because they induce a person to perform acts which give him pleasure These kinds of nourishment are sweet, juicy, substantial and agreeable to the eye

9 2 Food that agrees with a rajas person is bitter, sour, too salty, very hot, very biting, dry and burning Such food being of rajas nature increases unhappiness, sorrow, illness and eventually rajas

10 3 Food that is stale, spoiled, reeking, putrid, that consists of left-overs of persons who are not gurus and that does not consist of sacrificial remnants <sup>6.24</sup> agrees with a tamas person It increases tamas

Therefore, people who in their own interest want to increase their sattva should partake of nothing but sattva food

b *Sacrifices*

11 1 sattva a sacrifice which is sanctioned by the s̥āstras and is performed, not to gain a certain result, but as an end in itself, as a propitiation of God

12 2 rajas a sacrifice which is performed to gain a certain result and to win a reputation

13 3 tamas a sacrifice which is not performed with the sanction of virtuous brahmans who are familiar with the ritual, nor with mantra, daksinā and faith, and the substance of which is not of the recommended kind

<sup>6.2</sup> R the expl of the varieties of ritual acts begins with that of the varieties of food because food lies at the root of all

<sup>6.23</sup> R equates here *sattva* with *antahkarana* (above n 619) and the latter with its effect knowledge

<sup>6.24</sup> *amedhyam* G = R. *ajayārham ajayāsṣṭam ity arthak*

c. *Tapas*.

Tapas may be of the body, the tongue and the mind Tapas of the 14  
body entails: worship of gods, gurus, sages, brahmans; purification by  
ablution in tirthas etc.; sincerity of bodily actions; chastity; non-  
violence Tapas of the tongue entails: unhurting veracity; agreeable 15  
and auspicious language; the practice of the Veda task Tapas of the 16  
mind entails: serenity;<sup>625</sup> benevolence; control over one's language;  
exclusive attention for the ātman

1. sattva: the above threefold tapas, if in perfect faith performed by 17  
people who do not aim at any result but regard it as a propitiation  
of God.

2. rajas: tapas performed to gain a result — e.g. to win a reputation <sup>626</sup> 18  
— and therefore motivated by conceit; being a means of achieving a  
certain end it induces a person to keep moving lest he fall and be subject  
to annihilation.

3. tamas: tapas unreasonably performed by undesirous people who 19  
thereby torture themselves because they do not investigate the possi-  
bilities of themselves; and tapas performed to destroy other people.

d. *Charity*.

1. sattva: charity disinterestedly done at the right time and in the 20  
right place to the right person who has no profit to offer in return

2. rajas: charity, if that means the presentation of a not beautiful gift 21  
made with a veiled hint at an expected reward

3. tamas: charity not done at the right time and in the right place to 22  
the right person, and done without any ceremony of cleansing the feet  
etc. and without courtesy.

3. *Vedic acts are characterized by Om, Tat and Sat.*

Om, Tat and Sat are the three words which accompany Vedic ritual 23  
acts.<sup>627</sup> The syllable Om accompanies the sacrifice because it is a  
preliminary act <sup>628</sup> in itself, and is therefore used at the beginning of a  
Vedic sacrifice etc. The words Tat and Sat accompany the sacrifice  
because the first is a term for the object of worship and the latter  
expresses a property. Those who are connected with these three words,

<sup>625</sup> *manahprasādaḥ* G. = R. *manasaḥ krodhādinaḥ* *ātmatam*.

<sup>626</sup> R. viz. *sākhāramāṇapūjā*, resp. "homage paid by mind, tongue and body".

<sup>627</sup> *brahman-* = Veda = Vedic act.

<sup>628</sup> *anga-*.

ie persons of the first three stations,<sup>629</sup> brahmans, ksatriyas and vaiśyas who are entitled to perform Vedic sacrifices, and the Vedas and the sacrifices themselves have all been created by God in the beginning

#### 4 *How the three words are connected with the ritual*

24 a Om The ritual acts prescribed by the Vedas, which are performed by persons of the first three stations, will always proceed after the syllable Om has been pronounced. Moreover the Veda is always remembered together with the word Om

25 b Tat The ritual acts which are performed by persons of the first three stations who do not aim at the results but aspire to release may be expressed by the word Tat — which is a word for Brahman —<sup>630</sup> because these acts constitute various means of attaining Brahman

26—27 c Sat The word Sat is, in Vedic and in common usage, used in the sense of 'existing' and 'good'. Therefore the devotion of Vedic persons of the first three stations to sacrifice, tapas and charity is said to be sat because it is good. The acts which are auspicious for these persons are also said to be sat or good

So the Vedas, Vedic acts and Vedic persons are characterized by their connection with the three words Om, Tat and Sat, and thereby distinguished from what is not Veda or Vedic

28 Whatever ritual acts — sacrifices etc. — are performed without faith are asat, although they may correspond to the precepts of the sastras. The reason for this is that these acts will never lead either to a result in samsara or, beyond samsara, to release

## VI MISCELLANEOUS

### 1 *Tyāga and Samnyāsa are synonyms*

18, 1 *Question* According to the śruti<sup>631</sup> both tyāga and samnyāsa are means of attaining release. Now what do both words exactly signify? If they are not synonymous, what exactly is their difference?

2 *Answer* Some sages hold that samnyāsa being relinquishment of desiderative acts is as such synonymous with tyāga, whereas others say that tyāga means relinquishment, not only of desiderative, but also

<sup>629</sup> G *brāhmaṇa* explained as qualified for *brahman* or Vedic acts (cf. above n 627)

<sup>630</sup> R quotes MBh 13.149.92 *sa rah kah yat tat padam anuttamam*’

<sup>631</sup> R quotes TaittUp 4.12 and MuṇḍUp 2.26

of periodical and occasional acts.<sup>632</sup> So their difference would be one 3  
in degree. Certain sages, adherents of Kapila, nay, even orthodox  
followers of Kapila,<sup>633</sup> contend that all acts should be renounced by  
aspirants to release, because acts, like passion and other defects, only  
bind them. Others again maintain that these acts should not be  
relinquished.

Now, God's decision is this: tyāga is threefold, as has been said before,<sup>634</sup> viz. the tyāga or renunciation of the result of the acts, the ātman's possessiveness with regard to the act, and the ātman's agency in acting. The acts themselves, sacrifice etc., should not be renounced by the aspirant, but on the contrary be performed until his death, for they purify the worshipping<sup>635</sup> aspirant of his previous karman which is incompatible with his worship. God's supreme doctrine is that the aspirant should perform the acts as propitiations of God, while renouncing his possessiveness and the result of his act. Saṁnyāsa, or relinquishment, of periodical and occasional acts<sup>636</sup> is wrong, for without acts it is impossible even to sustain the body.<sup>637</sup> If sustained by sacrificial remnants, the body enables the person to acquire perfect knowledge; if not, it will bring him to error.<sup>638</sup> The śruti states that food nourishes the mind and that the immediate presentation of Brahman depends on the purity of one's food.<sup>639</sup> So it is wrong to relinquish periodical and occasional acts, such as the mahāyajñas, because then one cannot sustain one's body by sacrificial food. The relinquishment of these acts because of the erroneous notion that they bind the performer is rooted in tamas, i.e. in the ignorance effected by tamas.<sup>640</sup> Still, although they recognize that the acts may gradually lead to release, some fear lest they ruin the performer's mind, because the activities required for them — the earning of money etc. — cause

632 R.: this means that *saṃnyāsa-* and *tyāga-* are in any case synonymous, as will be amply proved by st. 4; 7 and 12 infra.

as will be amply proved by st. 4; 7 and 12 infra.

founder of Sāṃkhya; the theory is that of *māyā* (illusion) as well as *nirvāṇa*.  
G. 3,30: *māyā sarvātmani karmājñā samanyajñā śīmaśāntatā* / nirvāṇam  
*bhūtaḥ yudhyasā nigatajīvarah* // where *nirvāṇik* means the renunciation of results,  
*nirmama* that of possessiveness, and *māyā samanyajñā* that of personal agency.

irmamah that of possessiveness, and mayi samnyasya  
625 manjindim G. = R. mananailindim: mananaim upanaim

634 R.'s expl. of *G. nigata*.

637 R. refers to G. 3.8.

R. refers to G. 3,13.

430 R. quotes ChUp. 6,5,4 *anamatyaṃ hi samā manasā* etc. *śuddhaṃ satvāśuddhiḥ* etc.

as R. refers to st. 32 infra where false knowledge is *ajñāna* —  
buddhih.

suffering and because the acts themselves, requiring strenuous efforts, vex the body. If on account of some such fear a man decides to devote himself to the practice of knowledge and to relinquish his proper acts, then his relinquishment is rooted in rajas. He will not acquire the result of his relinquishment, that is knowledge, for that would be contrary to the sâstra<sup>641</sup>. In fact, the acts do not clear the manas in a visible way, but (in an invisible manner) through the grace of God.

- 9 One should justly hold that the periodical and occasional acts<sup>642</sup> proper to each man's station and stage of life, are to be performed for their own sake, as a propitiation of God, and consequently one should renounce possessiveness and result. This renunciation is rooted in sattva, 11 is true knowledge<sup>643</sup> of the purport of the sâstras. Then one will be animated by sattva, possessed of true knowledge and no longer doubtful, and renounce the result and one's agency of and one's interest in one's acts. So one will not hate acts with undesirable results — which occasion negligence<sup>644</sup> — or like acts with desirable results<sup>645</sup>.

Summing up, the sâstra prescribes that the interest in, and the result and the agency of, acts should be relinquished, but not the acts themselves. A dehin possessed of a body that should be sustained cannot give up all acting, for acts are necessary to sustain the body, and consequently the mahayajñas are necessary. Only he who renounces the results of his acts<sup>646</sup> is rightly called a tyāgin<sup>647</sup>.

- 12 *Question* But do the sastras not prescribe the ritual acts in connection with their respective results? But then, when one is to perform these acts, one is at the same time bound to reap their fruits, whether they are aimed at or not! These fruits being incompatible with release, the aspirant must refrain from all acting.

*Answer* No, for the results (which are of three kinds: undesirable — hell etc., desirable — heaven etc., and mixed — son, cattle etc.) will come, at a time subsequent to the performance of the corresponding acts, only to those who are not tyāgins in the above sense, but they will not come to the tyāgins. So, the results of periodical acts are avoided, if the performer acts only for the sake of release in the same way as he might have acted to sustain his body or to materia-

<sup>641</sup> R. refers to st. 31 infra.

<sup>642</sup> for G. *niyata-* as above n. 636

<sup>643</sup> R. refers to G. 14.17 and 18.30

<sup>644</sup> R. refers to KathUp. 1.24

<sup>645</sup> G. *kusala-* and *akusala* resp.

<sup>646</sup> R. this implies the renunciation of interest and agency as well

<sup>647</sup> R. as witness MahanarUp. 10.5 *tyāgenaike amṛtatam asmute*

lize his desires. It all depends on the end to which the acts are applied; that they may be applied to achieve release is proved by the śruti.<sup>648</sup> Therefore, saṁnyāsa is the renunciation of one's interest in, and of the results of and one's agency of, one's acts, and so is synonymous with tyāga.

## 2. God is the agent of the acts.

It is now explained how one may realize that the ātman is non-agent 13 by realizing that God, the Supreme Ātman, the inner Ruler, is the agent; so that one may relinquish all possessiveness with regard to acts and results: for 'it is God who performs acts by means of the jīvātman — which is his — and its organs — which are his — for the sake of his own sport; which proves that God's jīvātman is responsible for all acts and results. —

Those who know the sāmkhya say, on the strength of their positive conviction which is formed by the Vedic buddhi concerning things as they really are,<sup>649</sup> that five causes bring about the success of all actions. 14—15 These five causes are now set forth. In all actions, whether corporeal, oral or mental, which are either enjoined or forbidden by the śāstras,<sup>650</sup> there are five causes:

1. the body, that conglomeration of gross elements which is governed by the jīvātman; <sup>651</sup>
2. the agent, which is the jīvātman; <sup>652</sup>
3. the motorial senses with the mind, which work out in different ways to complete an action; <sup>653</sup>
4. the different functions of the fivefold vital air; <sup>654</sup>
5. the Supreme Ātman as the inner Ruler who is the main cause.<sup>655</sup>

The jīvātman derives its agency from the Supreme Ātman, as

<sup>648</sup> BĀU. 6,4,22.

<sup>649</sup> R. obviously derives sāmkhya- from saṁkhyā = buddhi- (cf. G. 2,39). so sāmkhya- "that which is realized by the vaidiki buddhi, the knowledge about Vedic lore" (R.: the Vedic buddhi realizes that God is agent by means of body, senses, prāṇas and jīvātman, as asserted by BĀU. 3,7,22 (M.) and Taittār. 3,11,2);

kr̥tānte G. = R. nirṇaye which I interpret *ketau saptaṁst*.

<sup>650</sup> G. nyāyā- and vipartita- resp.

<sup>651</sup> adhi- √sthā, hence adhiṣṭhānam = body.

<sup>652</sup> as is proved by VS. 2,3,19 jāo, 'ta eva and 2,3,33 kavis, *īstuvāṁsthanu*.

<sup>653</sup> = G. karṇam pṛthagvidham.

<sup>654</sup> R.: *ceṣṭābhāsa pañcātmā* vāyur adhiṣṭhātā.

<sup>655</sup> R. refers to G. 15,15 and 18,61.



witness the Sūtras <sup>656</sup> The objection that in that case the jīvātman cannot be bound to act is disposed of by the author of the Sūtras in the explanation that God makes the jīvātman act, while considering its volitional effort <sup>657</sup> That means that the jīvātman itself makes, by his own will and by means of his body, organs etc and the powers inherent in them, an effort which depends on that body etc , that body etc are, however, granted by God So God actuates the jīvātman, within whom He resides, by granting it his permission, but it is the jīvātman itself which is the cause of its activity, and therefore it is subjected to the injunctions of the sāstras, because it acts by its own free will For example when a number of people co-operate in removing a rock, they together constitute the cause of the removal, but the one person for whose sake the rock is removed is alone responsible for the removal of the rock, though it be effected by many persons <sup>658</sup>

- 16 So, he who perceives that the ātman alone is agent, whereas actually the ātman derives its agency from the permission of God, is mistaken, for he does not perceive the real agent because his knowledge of the  
17 real state of affairs is incomplete He, however, who has rightly directed his mind to the difference in agency, because he realizes that God is the agent, and so is not subject to the misconception of egoity, that is, that he acts himself, and who has the insight that he, while acting, is not bound by the result because actually he is not agent, — he then, although he have slain all these hosts of enemies, does in fact not slay at all and is not bound to experience the results

### 3 Description of the effects of sattva, rajas and tamas

- 18 The injunction to acts, like jyotistoma etc , is compounded by three elements 1 knowledge about the act which is to be performed, 2 the act to be performed, 3 the knower of that act The act itself — the object of the knowledge sub 1 — is compounded by three elements 1 the required means, substance etc , 2 the action, sacrifice etc , 3 the performer  
19 The knowledge of the act to be performed, the act to be performed, and the performer of the act are threefold, each of them being divided according to the three gunas Now one should hear, while the effects of the gunas are summed up, how the above elements, knowledge etc , are divided according to the gunas

<sup>656</sup> viz VS 23.40 parāt tu, tac chruteh

<sup>657</sup> VS 23.41 kṛtāprayatnāpekṣas tu, vaktāpratiśiddhāvayarthādibhṛāh

<sup>658</sup> cf Ch III, p 15 16

## 1 Knowledge

- a *sattva* that knowledge by which all different beings — different in station and stage of life — are seen <sup>650</sup> to have in common an unitative principle, the *atman*, and therefore to be equal in spite of their differences, and imperishable, in spite of the transitoriness of their bodies, and untransformed and incapable of interest in the results of their acts 20
- b *rajas* that knowledge by which the *atmans* in all beings are, on account of their existing in a plurality of forms, held to be manifold and different and to be capable of taking interest in results etc 21
- c *tamas* that knowledge which is directed entirely to one act <sup>660</sup> — which will have an extremely limited result — as though it would have all possible results, which, consequently, is unreasonably directed; which has an erroneous content as it involves the above notion that the *atmans* are different, and which has but a limited result 22

## 2 Act

- a *sattva* an act proper to station and stage of life, not involving interest because of the misconception that one is agent oneself, not performed to win fame or not to win notoriety, i.e. without, conceit, and without a desire of its result 23
- b *rajas* an act, performed for the sake of the result on account of the misconception that oneself is the agent and has performed the act with strenuous efforts 24
- c *tamas* an act, performed without consideration for the pains pertinent to the performance of acts, <sup>661</sup> for the loss of money, the hurting of living beings and for the *atman's* capacity of completing the act, this lack of consideration being due to ignorance of God's agency 25

## 3 Performer

- a *sattva* a performer who is not interested in the result, has not the idea that he is the agent, who, while acting, endures the pains which necessarily appear before the act is completed, who is energetic, and whose mind is not transformed by success or failure of the act and of the preparatory activities 26

<sup>650</sup> R. i.e. at the time of undertaking an act, hence the connection of this knowledge with the ritual act, the *vidya* of st. 18 supra "the knowledge of the act to be performed", the same applies to *rajas* and *tamas* knowledge.

<sup>660</sup> R. acts like sacrifices to ghosts, deceased ancestors etc.

<sup>661</sup> P. *kṛte karmāṇy anubodhāṃśu maduḥkṛtāṃ anubodhāḥ*.

- 27 b *rajas* a performer who aspires to fame, seeks the results, does not want to spend the money required for the act, who, while acting, hurts others, who is not pure and who rejoices in success and is grieved at failure
- 28 c *tamas* a performer who is not qualified to perform sastric acts,<sup>602</sup> who is uninstructed<sup>603</sup> and lazy, who has a preference for magic<sup>604</sup> etc, who is deceitful and lax even if the act has already been started, who is uninstructed<sup>603</sup> and lazy, who has a preference for magic,<sup>604</sup> pays malevolent attention to others for a long stretch of time
- 29 The positive knowledge<sup>605</sup> which results from discrimination, as well as stubborn perseverance<sup>606</sup> when an action has begun, are also threefold according to the governing *guna*

## 1 *Buddhi*

- 30 a *sattva* knowledge of the *dharma* leading to fortune and the *dharma* leading to release,<sup>607</sup> of what ought and what ought not to be done of the respective practices of the above *dharma*s in different places, times and circumstances, of the fact that not observing the *sastra* is dangerous and observing the *sastra* is tranquillizing, and of the truth about *samsara* and release from *samsara*
- 31 b *rajas* inexact knowledge of the above *dharma* and its opposite, of what ought and what ought not to be done of their respective practices in different places, times and circumstances
- 32 c *tamas* false knowledge by which all ends are misconceived *dharma* is mistaken for *adharma* and reversely advantage for non advantage and reversely, higher for lower truth and reversely

## 2 *Dhṛti*

- 33 a *sattva* perseverance by which all activities of mind, *prana* and senses which are permanently directed to, and which are means to, the worship of God as a means of attaining release are endured
- 34 b *rajas* perseverance of a person desirous of results by which the

<sup>602</sup> *ayuktah* G = R *sāstrīyakarmāṇyogyaḥ*

<sup>603</sup> *prākṛtaḥ* G = R *anadhigatavdyah*

<sup>604</sup> *saṁhah* G = R *abhicārādikarmarucih*

<sup>605</sup> G *buddhi-* is explained by *vivekaḥ* *śrīrājanīśāyārāṇaḥ jñānam*

<sup>606</sup> G *dhṛti-* explained by perseverance (*vidhāraṇa*) when an action which is a means to release has been undertaken but meets with an obstacle

<sup>607</sup> resp G *pravṛtti* and *nivṛtti* which are here taken in the sense of their cause *dharma* cf n. 608.

activities of mind, prana and senses as means of attaining dharma, artha and kâma are endured <sup>668</sup>

c tamas perseverance of the fool by which he persists in those activities of mind etc which bring about sleep and perplexity and which are directed to objects that bring about fear, sorrow and despair 35

Now it is said which happiness — again threefold according to the governing guna — results from the above knowledge, act and agency, in which happiness incomparable joy and the end of all grief in samsara may eventually be found after long practice 36

a sattva happiness which at the beginning of yoga is like unhappiness because its realization requires strenuous efforts and because then the distinct proper form of the atman is not yet cognized, and which at the end is like elixir because the distinct proper form of the atman appears perforce as a result of practice, and which originates from the total cessation of the buddhi's focusing on everything but the atman <sup>669</sup> 37

b rajas happiness which immediately when experienced is like elixir because then the senses contact the objects, but which at the end, when the hunger etc — which first caused the agreeableness of the objects — have ceased, is like poison because it will lead to hell etc 38

c tamas happiness which immediately when experienced and also at the end causes the atman to be ignorant of the truth about things and which is brought about by sleep, laxity of sensorial operation and negligence about one's task 39

All this signifies that an aspirant should suppress rajas and tamas and acquire sattva. There is no living being among men, in heaven or among gods who is free from the three prakṛti-born gunas 40

4 God can be attained by acts proper to one's station and stage of life

Tyāga or relinquishment — which is synonymous with samnyāsa — is a means to release <sup>670</sup> The relinquishment of result and act is brought about by the relinquishment of the agency of acts when acts are being performed, and this latter relinquishment is brought about by the realization that God is the agent. Now it will be said that such an act, which is performed as a means to release, constitutes a propitiation of God and that it results in the attainment of God. To introduce this topic the proper form of the acts is presently set forth, together with its 41

<sup>668</sup> i.e. the puruṣārthas, in contrast with release which is parama-*artha*.  
<sup>669</sup> G. *atmabuddhi-prasāda* is the "clearance (of all concern for other objects) of the buddhi which is solely concerned with the atman."  
<sup>670</sup> R. refers to MahānirUp. 10.5

functions and differences according to the various gunas of the natures of their performers

The gunas originate from the nature, or the previous karman, of brahmans, ksatriyas, and vaiśyas which has caused them to be born in their proper station Sattva arises when rajas and tamas are suppressed and originates from the brahman's nature, rajas arises when sattva and tamas are suppressed and originates from the ksatriya's nature, tamas preponderates slightly in the vaiśya and strongly in the śūdra from whose nature it originates when sattva and rajas are suppressed The acts of these various stations, differing according to the governing guna, are expounded by the sastras

- 42 a From the brahman's nature arises the act of control over the external and internal organs, <sup>671</sup> *śāstric chastisement of the body, qualification to śāstric acts, endurance, sincere behaviour, positive conviction that this is truly the purport of the Veda that God is the Supreme Brahman with all his divine attributes* <sup>672</sup>
- 43 b The acts proper to the ksatriya's nature are heroism, invincibility, stubborn perseverance, <sup>673</sup> competence, the holding out in a desperate fight, the sacrificing of possessions to bestow them on others, and the power to rule others
- 44 c The acts proper to the vaiśya are agriculture, cattlebreeding and trade
- d The natural task of the śūdra is service to the above ranks

The acts and tasks summed up above are illustrative they imply acts like sacrifices etc, prescribed by the sastras, as well as the different functions of all four stations, the sacrifice, naturally, is proper to the first three stations, brahmans, ksatriyas and vaiśyas alike, the various tasks of the brahman — viz control over external and internal organs etc — are proper to the aspirants of all three stations But they are here assigned to the nature of the brahman since it is easy for a brahman to accept these tasks because in him sattva naturally preponderates, whereas they are not assigned to the ksatriya and the vaiśya because in them rajas and tamas naturally preponderate — The brahman's functions are sacrificing for others, teaching and accepting the ksatriya's function is protecting the people, the vaiśya's husbandry etc, and the śūdra's service

<sup>671</sup> G *sama* and *dama*- resp

<sup>672</sup> G *śāstrīya* R. refers to G 15.15, 10.8 7.7 5.29 17.46, and 10.3

<sup>673</sup> for *dhyti* see above n 666

A man devoted to his proper task attains the highest end How? 45  
 When by means of his proper acts he has worshipped God as the inner 46  
 Ruler of divinities like Indra etc — to whom his sacrifices are  
 directed —, he will attain God,<sup>674</sup> who is the cause of the activity of all 47  
 beings and the pervader of the universe,<sup>675</sup> by the grace of God There-  
 fore, one's proper dharma — relinquishment of agency etc — which  
 constitutes a propitiation of God is very easy to perform for a person  
 who is conjoined with prakṛti because this dharma, or karmayoga, is  
 sensorial activity So, albeit defective, this proper <sup>676</sup> dharma or karma-  
 yoga is better than the dharma of another, — i.e. of a person capable  
 of controlling his senses — or jñānayoga, because the latter involves the  
 risk of negligence Consequently, since action is natural to a person  
 conjoined with prakṛti because it means sensorial activity, that person 48  
 will not implicate himself in saṃsāra when he acts On the other hand,  
 since jñānayoga involves negligence because it can only be executed  
 when the senses are restrained, a person devoted to jñānayoga may  
 implicate himself in saṃsāra this doctrine of Lecture III is here  
 resumed So, even if one is qualified for jñānayoga, one should not  
 relinquish action, which is easy because it is natural and which does  
 not involve negligence, even though it may bring about unhappiness  
 All performances, of karman as well as of jñāna, are accompanied by  
 unhappiness, but still there is this difference between the two that  
 karmayoga is easy and does not involve negligence in contrast to  
 jñānayoga

When the buddhi is not attached to anything — result etc. — when 49  
 the mind is controlled, when one does not desire to be agent oneself  
 because one realizes that God is the agent, and when, therefore, one  
 has positive samnyāsa and so performs acts, one will, despite one's  
 actions, reach the supreme state or dhyānayoga — which also results 50  
 from jñānayoga —, that is the cessation of sensorial activity <sup>677</sup> Now  
 one should hear in what manner one will attain brahman,<sup>678</sup> once one  
 has achieved the dhyānasiddhi which is attainable through lifelong daily  
 practice of karmayoga this brahman is the highest attainable end of 51—53  
 that knowledge which is dhyāna. One is qualified to be brahman, i.e.  
 to be released from all bonds and to experience the ātman in its pure

<sup>674</sup> R. *siddhi-* means here 'the attainment of God'

<sup>675</sup> R. refers to G 7.6-7, 9.4 and 10.10.7

<sup>676</sup> R. i.e. the dharma which one should appropriate.

<sup>677</sup> expl. of G *naṣṭakarmasiddhi-*

<sup>678</sup> to be taken in the sense of "the released ātman". see below

form, when one practices dhyānayoga in the following manner:<sup>679</sup> directing the buddhi to the pure ātman; qualifying the mind by turning it away from the objects; removing the objects; renouncing the preference and aversion occasioned by the objects; living at a place where nothing can hinder the dhyāna; eating neither too much nor too little; directing the operations of body, speech and mind to dhyāna; being constantly intent on dhyānayoga until death; taking an aversion to all objects but the one entity to be meditated upon, by considering the defectiveness of the objects; giving up the misconception of egoity as well as the forcible influence of vāsanā which nourishes this misconception, and the resulting pride, desire, anger and possessions; being free from the notion that that which is not the ātman's is the ātman's; and finding one's sole happiness in experiencing the ātman.

- 54 Then, when the proper form of one's ātman, whose nature is to be a śeṣa of God<sup>680</sup> and whose form is unlimited knowledge,<sup>681</sup> has been revealed and this proper form is not contaminated by the kleśas,<sup>682</sup> acts etc., one will not mourn over any being but God, nor desire any being but God, but be equal and indifferent towards all beings; not caring for anything, one will acquire bhakti towards God — supreme bhakti which is the experiencing of the most dearly beloved One.
- 55 Through such bhakti a man will know God in all the majesty of his proper form and nature, virtues and manifestations; and immediately after knowing, he will attain God in virtue of<sup>683</sup> his boundless supreme
- 56 bhakti. This is the crowning development of the disinterested performance of periodical and occasional acts proper to station and stage of life, which are performed to propitiate God. But it crowns also the desiderative acts: when one performs, not only the periodical and occasional acts, but also<sup>684</sup> the desiderative acts while relinquishing one's agency to God, then one will by God's grace completely attain
- 57 that eternal end which is God. Therefore, one should leave all acts — together with agency and object — to God because one knows that one is ruled by God; and, while realizing that it is God who is to be

<sup>679</sup> which proves that *dhyāna*— here is not synonymous with bhakti, but means the knowledge in the contemplation of the ātman as discussed in Lectures 4 and 5.

<sup>680</sup> R. refers to G. 7,5.

<sup>681</sup> expl. of G. *brahmabhūtataḥ*.

<sup>682</sup> the five kleśas are ignorance (*avidyā*), egoity (*asmitā*), preference (*rāga*-), aversion (*dveṣa*-) and affection (*abhiniveśa*-), VAK. s.v.

<sup>683</sup> R. G. *tatas* must refer to bhakti, for bhakti is the only means to attain God, as witness G. 11,54.

<sup>684</sup> for G. reads "all acts" (*sarvākarmāṇi*).

attained, and in that spirit performing one's acts and devoting oneself  
to this buddhiyoga, one should always keep God in mind Then, while 58  
being absorbed in God and performing all acts, one will escape from all  
dangers of samsāra by the grace of God When, however, one refrains  
from listening to God's word, because one thinks that one knows  
everything that ought and ought not to be done, then one will be lost,  
for God alone knows what all living beings ought and ought not to do,  
and He is their law-giver

When Arjuna is under the delusion that he knows of his own 59  
accord what is good for him and what not, and, not heeding God's  
command, decides not to fight, then this independent decision of his  
will be fruitless, for his prakṛti will make him submit to God's com-  
mand, although his fool's mind is grieved by the fact that independence 60  
is only of God <sup>655</sup> For heroism is the ksatriya's natural duty, and bound  
by this duty he will be unable to suffer the enemies' insults and he will  
engage them in the battle which he now shirks out of ignorance All 61  
beings are forced by the Lord to follow their prakṛti in accordance  
with their previous karman the Lord Vasudeva, who is wont to rule  
all, resides in the heart of all beings <sup>656</sup> — the heart from which arises  
all knowledge and on which all action and inaction depends —, while  
all acting by means of his own māyā — which consists of guṇas — all  
beings which are put in that mechanism which is called prakṛti developed 62  
into body and senses For this reason Arjuna should be completely sub-  
mitted to God, <sup>657</sup> the Lord of all If not, then he will still have to fight  
the battle, inevitably, for his ignorance, stimulated by God's māya, will  
make him do so Therefore he should fight the battle in the manner  
which God has explained, then God's grace will make him attain  
supreme sānti — the release from all bonds of all acts — and the  
eternal end <sup>658</sup>

Herewith the knowledge which is to be acquired by the aspirant 63  
to release, that most secret knowledge of karma- and bhaktiyoga, is set  
forth in its entirety, and, considering it in its entirety, one should do  
what one wishes to do so far as one's qualifications reach perform  
karma-, jñāna- or bhaktiyoga at one's option

<sup>655</sup> *matrāḍḍāntṛṇāyodvignamānāsam aṇām.*

<sup>656</sup> R. refers to G 15,15, 10,8 and BĀU 3,7,22 (M)

<sup>657</sup> *īśānam gaccha sarvabhūteṣu* G = R. *sarvāṇāṃśu* *śāntam* *eva* *śāntiṃ*

<sup>658</sup> R. refers to RV 1,22,20 TaittS 4,7,131 RV 1164,50 RV 12,12,7  
NirUp. 10,21, and ChUp. 3,13,7



- 64 It has been said<sup>689</sup> that bhaktiyoga is the most secret of all secrets because it is the best way to salvation. Now Arjuna should hear God's final word on bhakti, God speaks this word to Arjuna's advantage,
- 65 because Arjuna is very dear to him. He should practise that continuous representation — synonymous with knowledge, worship, meditation etc — which has the form of contemplation and which is most dear to the worshipper<sup>690</sup>. He should love God excessively and therefore practise the above representation while being completely absorbed in the worship of God,<sup>691</sup> and humiliate himself before God. If he does so, then, God promises,<sup>692</sup> he shall attain God, for he is held very dear by God, so that He cannot endure being separated from him and hence makes him reach
- 66 Himself. While performing all dharmas — i.e. karma-, jñāna- and bhaktiyoga which are means of attaining supreme bliss — at his option according to his qualifications, and at the same time relinquishing their result, his agency etc, he should realize that God alone is the agent, the object, the end and the means<sup>693</sup>. Then God will release him from all evil incompatible with his attainment of God, evil piled up by endless wrong activities in beginningless times; therefore he should not despair<sup>694</sup>.
- 67 This most secret doctrine should not be taught to someone who does not practise tapas, nor to someone who practises tapas but not bhakti, nor to someone who, though he practises bhakti, does not listen, nor certainly<sup>695</sup> to someone who discovers defects in God's proper
- 68 form, his sovereignty and his virtues. But he who explains it to bhaktas will, when he has practised supreme bhakti towards God,

<sup>689</sup> G 9,1

<sup>690</sup> interpretation of G *manmanā bhaktā*, for this passage cf. ÇBh 1,1,1, p. 8-10 (Th. p. 13-16)

<sup>691</sup> = G *madhyasti* R *zajanam pñjanam / ārdhanam hi pariparnaseṣavṛttih* 'propitiatory worship is the complete performance by a subservient person of all services which are due to his master' on this passage cf. 9.34

<sup>692</sup> R. remarks that this promise must be taken literally, not merely as a flattering turn of speech (*upacchanda*)

<sup>693</sup> R. this is the sastric relinquishment of all acts, see forth above 4.9 and 11

<sup>694</sup> R. gives an alternative expl. of 66 cd. Arjuna should not despair of being capable of bhaktiyoga: he should forsake all various, endless and — on account of the brevity of life — impracticable dharmas (expiatory rites) corresponding to all various endless sins piled up in beginningless times which are incompatible with bhaktiyoga, and, in order to succeed in bhaktiyoga, he should take refuge in God: then God will rescue him from all his sins, see my remarks Intr. Ch. IV, p. 27

<sup>695</sup> *asamānābhaktiurdeśas tasyāntapariharanīyatājnāpamāya*.

- 64 It has been said<sup>689</sup> that bhaktiyoga is the most secret of all secrets because it is the best way to salvation. Now Arjuna should hear God's final word on bhakti, God speaks this word to Arjuna's advantage,
- 65 because Arjuna is very dear to him. He should practise that continuous representation — synonymous with knowledge, worship, meditation etc — which has the form of contemplation and which is most dear to the worshipper<sup>690</sup>. He should love God excessively and therefore practise the above representation while being completely absorbed in the worship of God,<sup>691</sup> and humiliate himself before God. If he does so, then, God promises,<sup>692</sup> he shall attain God, for he is held very dear by God, so that He cannot endure being separated from him and hence makes him reach
- 66 Himself. While performing all dharmas — i.e. karma-, jñāna- and bhaktiyoga which are means of attaining supreme bliss — at his option according to his qualifications, and at the same time relinquishing their result, his agency etc., he should realize that God alone is the agent, the object, the end and the means<sup>693</sup>. Then God will release him from all evil incompatible with his attainment of God, evil piled up by endless wrong activities in beginningless times; therefore he should not despair<sup>694</sup>.
- 67 This most secret doctrine should not be taught to someone who does not practise tapas, nor to someone who practises tapas but not bhakti, nor to someone who, though he practises bhakti, does not listen, nor certainly<sup>695</sup> to someone who discovers defects in God's proper
- 68 form, his sovereignty and his virtues. But he who explains it to bhaktas will, when he has practised supreme bhakti towards God,

<sup>689</sup> G 9,1

<sup>690</sup> interpretation of G *mānana bhava* for this passage cf. CBh 1,11, p 8-10 (Th p 13 16)

<sup>691</sup> = G *madhyasti* R. *yajanam pujanam / āradhanam hi paripūrṇasevayitih* 'propitiatory worship is the complete performance by a subservient person of all services which are due to his master' on this passage cf. 9.34

<sup>692</sup> R. remarks that this promise must be taken literally not merely as a flattering turn of speech (*upacchanda*)

<sup>693</sup> R. this is the sastric relinquishment of all acts see forth above 4.9 and 11

<sup>694</sup> R. gives an alternative expl. of 66 cd. Arjuna should not despair if being capable of bhaktiyoga he should forsake all various endless and — on account of the brevity of life — impracticable dharmas (expiatory rites) corresponding to all various endless sins piled up in beginningless times which are incompatible with bhaktiyoga and in order to succeed in bhaktiyoga he should take refuge in God then God will rescue him from all his sins, see my remarks Intr. Ch. IV p. 27

<sup>695</sup> *asamānān-bhaktinirdeśas tarjātyanta-pariharaṇīyatājñāpādaya.*

indubitably attain God: no one has ever acted or will ever act more to 69  
 God's pleasure than he does. He who will learn this dialogue of God 70  
 and Arjuna on dharma will be regarded by God as if he had performed  
 a sacrifice of knowledge.<sup>696</sup> A man who with faith and without criticism 71  
 just listens to it will thereby be released from all evil which is in-  
 compatible with bhakti and join the hosts of the bhaktas.

Then God questioned Arjuna: "Have you listened attentively to 72  
 all that I have said? Has your perplexity of ignorance which made  
 you refuse to do battle vanished?"

Arjuna answered that by God's grace his delusion has vanished and 73  
 that he had acquired true knowledge of things as they really are, i.e. the  
 delusion that the ātman is prakṛti, that all spiritual and non-spiritual  
 substances which constitute God's body are not ensouled by God, and  
 that action, periodical and occasional, which actually is a propitiation  
 of God and therefore a means to attain him, could implicate its per-  
 former in saṃsāra, has now given way to the knowledge that the ātman  
 is different from prakṛti and so has a different nature — the nature of  
 being the knower of prakṛti — and is essentially a śeṣa of God and is  
 ruled by God, as well as to the discriminating knowledge<sup>697</sup> of the  
 truth about God the Supreme Brahman, that of the higher and lower  
 Truth about the ātman, and the knowledge that God is the Supreme  
 Person who can be known by the Vedānta and who can only be attained  
 by worship through bhakti which is to be achieved by means of the  
 virtues of the ātman — control over external and internal organs etc.<sup>698</sup>  
 — and of cautious performance of periodical and occasional acts —  
 which presuppose the regular practice of the former knowledge and  
 are accumulated day after day — whose sole reward is the gracious  
 love of God. Therefore Arjuna is now freed from his despair which  
 resulted from error nourished by his love and compassion for his  
 relatives, and, being no longer doubtful, he has been restored to his old  
 self. Henceforth he will observe God's words, dealing with the necessity  
 of fighting etc.: he will enter into battle.

Then Saṃjaya related to Dhṛtarāṣṭra that he had heard this moving 74  
 and wondrous dialogue of Kṛṣṇa and Arjuna, possessed of great  
 buddhi,<sup>699</sup> who had resorted to Kṛṣṇa, in this very form in which he

<sup>696</sup> R.: this jñānayajña- is the complete dialogue of the G. by learning it  
 one offers this jñānayajña-.

<sup>697</sup> vijñāna-.

<sup>698</sup> those summed up above st. 42.

<sup>699</sup> mahātmajah G. = R. mahābuddheḥ.

75 has repeated it. Having obtained divine vision and hearing through the  
 favour of Vyāsa, he heard this supreme secret called Yoga from Kṛṣṇa  
 — that ocean of knowledge, force, sovereignty, perseverance and glory  
 76 — personally. As often as he recalls this auspicious and miraculous  
 dialogue which he has heard with his own ears, he is moved by joy; and  
 77 whenever he remembers that most wondrous, sovereign form of God  
 which He revealed to Arjuna and which Saṁjaya witnessed, he is  
 struck with amazement and stirred by joy.

78 But words fall short. Suffice it to say that wherever God, the Lord  
 of the conjunctions of spiritual and non-spiritual substances <sup>700</sup> — which  
 constitute his higher and lower natures —, He, on whose volition  
 depend the different proper forms, existences and activities of all  
 substances different from God, He, Kṛṣṇa, Vasudeva's son, is present,  
 and wherever Arjuna the Archer, the sister's son of Kṛṣṇa's father,  
 who resorted to Kṛṣṇa feet, is present, there — to his mind — will  
 happiness, victory, prosperity and unswerving morality be found.

<sup>700</sup> expl. of *yogeśvara*-, *yoga*- in the sense of "combination, association etc."

## APPENDIX

### Yāmuna's Gītārthasamgraha <sup>1</sup>

(vigāhe Yāmunam tīrtham sadhuvrndāvane sthitam  
murastajihmagasparsa yatra Kṛṣṇaḥ kṛtadarah )  
svadharmajñānavairagyasādhyaḥbhaktyekagocarah  
Nārāyaṇaḥ param brahma Gītāśāstre samīritah 1  
jñānakarmātmike nisthe yogalakṣe susamskrte  
ātmānubhūtiśiddhyartho pūrvasatkena codite 2  
madhyame bhagavattattvayāthātmyavaptiśiddhaye  
jñānakarmābhīnīrvartyo bhaktiyogah prakṛtitaḥ 3  
pradhānapurusavyaktasarvesvaravivecanam  
karmadhīr bhaktir ityādīpūrvaseso 'ntimoditaḥ 4  
asthānasnehakāruṇyadharmadharmadhiyākulam  
Pārtham prapannam uddi-ya sāstravataranam kṛtam 5  
nityātmāśāngakarmehagocarā samkhyayogadhiḥ  
dvitīye sthitadhīlakṣyā proktā tanmohasantaye 6  
asaktyā lokaraksāya guṇesv āropya kartṛtām  
sarvesvare vā nyasyoktā tritīye karmakāryatā 7  
prasāngāt svasvabhāvoktā karmāno 'karmatāsyā ca  
bheda jñānasya mātātmyam caturthadhyāya ucyate 8  
karmayogasya saukaryam saighryam kāścana tadvidhāḥ  
brahmajñānaprakāraḥ ca pañcamādhyāya ucyate 9  
yogābhyāsavidhīr yogī caturdhā yogasādhnam  
yogasiddhah <sup>2</sup> svayogasya pāramyam saṣṭha ucyate 10  
svayāthātmyam prakṛtyāsyā tīroddhiḥ saranāgatiḥ  
bhaktābhedaḥ prabuddhasya sraisthyam sapṭama ucyate 11  
aśvaryaśkarayāthātmyam <sup>3</sup> bhagavaccaranarthīnām  
vedyopādeyaḥbhavanām astame bheda ucyate 12

<sup>1</sup> I reproduce here Āpte's text as given in his edition of Rāmaṇuja's Gītābhāṣya (Ānandasrama Skt. Series vol 92, Bombay 1923) and add in notes the variant readings which appear in the parts of the GAS printed in Govindacārya's translation of the GBh, all of them are to be preferred to Āpte's readings.

<sup>2</sup> Gov yogandhiḥ

<sup>3</sup> Gov -yāthātmyabhagatuc-

svamahatmyam manusyatve paratvam ca mahātmanam  
 viseso navame yogo bhaktirūpah prakīrtitah. 13.  
 svakalyānagunānantyakrtsnasvādhīnatāmataḥ  
 bhaktyutpattivivṛddhyarthā vistīrnā dasamoditā 14.  
 ekādase 'sya yāthātmyasāksātkārāvalokanam  
 dattamuktā <sup>4</sup> vidiprāptyor <sup>5</sup> bhaktyekopāyatā tathā. 15.  
 bhaktisaighryam upāyoktir aśaktasyātmanisthatā  
 tatprakārās tv atipritir bhakter dvādasa ucyate 16.  
 dehasvarūpam atmāptihetur ātmavisodhanam  
 bandhahetur vivekas ca trayodasa udīryate 17.  
 gunabandhavidhau tesām kartṛtvam tannivartanam  
 gatitrayasvamūlatvam caturdasa udīryate 18  
 acinmisrad visuddhac ca cetanat purusottamah  
 vyāpanād bharanat svāmyād anyah pañcadasoditah 19.  
 devāsura vibhagoktipūrvika śastravaśyatā  
 tattvānusthanaviḥṇānasthemne sodasa ucyate 20  
 asastram āsuram krtsnam śāstrīyam gunataḥ prthak  
 laksanam śāstrasiddhasya tridhā saptadasoditam 21  
 isvare kartṛtābuddhīḥ sattvopādeyatantime  
 svakarmaparīnāmas ca śāstrasārārtha ucyate 22  
 karmayogas tapastīrthadanaya jñādisevanam  
 jñānayogo jitasvāntaḥ parīsuddhātmani sthitiḥ 23  
 bhaktiyogah paraikāntya prītyā dhyanadisu sthitiḥ  
 trayanam apī yogānam tribhir anyonyasamgamah 24  
 nityanaimittikānam ca pararādhanarūpinam  
 atmadr̥stes trayo 'py ete yogadvārena sādhakāḥ 25  
 nirastanikhilajñāna dr̥stvatmānam parānugam  
 pratilabhya param bhaktim tayaivāpnoti tatpadam 26  
 bhaktiyogas tadarthī cet samagrasvaryaśādhanam  
 ātmārthī cet trayo 'py ete tatkaivalyasya sādhakāḥ 27  
 aikāntyam bhagavaty eśām samanam adhikārīnām  
 yāvatprapti pararthi cet tad evātyantam asnute 28  
 jñāni tu paramaikānti tadayattatmajīvanah  
 tatsamslesaviyogaikasukhaduhkhas tadekadhiḥ 29  
 bhagavaddhyanayogoktavandanastutikīrtanaḥ  
 labdhatmā tadgatapranamanobudhīndriyakriyah 30  
 nijakarmādhikakṛtyantam kuryat prītyaiva karitah

<sup>4</sup> Gov *tattvam uktā*

<sup>5</sup> so, curiously, both Āpte and Gov : this irregular form should be emended  
 ॐ, cf. Yamuna, ĀS, p. 19 (sl) *saṁvṛtī*, p. 47 (sl) *tadvṛtī* and *arthavṛtī*

upāyatāṃ parityajya nyased deve tu tāmabhiḥ. 31.  
aikāntyātyantadāśyaikaṛatis tatpadam āpnuyāt  
tatpradhānam idaṃ śāstram iti Gītārthasaṃgrahaḥ. 32.

## Translation

(I bathe in the holy tīrtha of the river Yamunā which is situated in the blessed Vṛndāvana, where no snakes are to be met with and where homage is paid to Kṛṣṇa.)<sup>6</sup>

1. It is the doctrine expounded by the Bhagavadgītā that Nārāyaṇa, who is the Supreme Brahman, can only be attained by means of bhakti which is brought about by observance of the dharma, acquisition of knowledge and renunciation of passion.

2. In the first six Lectures it is commended to gain well-founded positions in knowledge and action directed to Yoga, in order to succeed in the presentation of the ātman.

3. In the Lectures 7—12 the bhaktiyoga, which can (only) be brought about by knowledge and action, is treated of as a means of attaining exact knowledge of God such as He is.<sup>7</sup>

4. The Lectures 13—18 deal with topics supplementary to the foregoing, such as matter, ātman, the evolved creation, the sovereign Lord, action, knowledge, bhakti etc.

5. The whole teaching is set forth for the sake of Arjuna who, overcome by misplaced love, compassion and anxiety about dharma and adharma, has taken refuge in God.

6. The 2nd Lecture treats of the knowledge<sup>8</sup> of sāmkhya and yoga, concerning the eternal ātman and disinterested activity respectively and culminating in mental fixation.

7. The 3rd Lecture demonstrates that acts should be performed, not for the sake of retribution,<sup>9</sup> but to save the world, and that the agency which those acts involve should either be attributed to the guṇas or imposed on God.

8. Apart from an incidental discussion of God's nature, the 4th Lec-

<sup>6</sup> this śloka contains an elaborate pun; it might be read "I betake myself to the venerable Yāmuna who has his place among the hosts of saints, among whom no crooked people are to be encountered and homage is paid to Kṛṣṇa"; the śloka is not Yāmuna's.

<sup>7</sup> *tattva*- "quiddity".

<sup>8</sup> *dhi* is synonymous with G. *buddhi*- (2,39) to which it corresponds.

<sup>9</sup> *asakti* "not because of one's interest in the results of one's acts".

ture deals with non-agency in activity, the divisions of acts and the eminence of knowledge

9 The 5th Lecture sets forth the easy practicability and quick efficacy of *karmayoga*, some similar topics and the knowledge of *brahman*

10 The 6th Lecture treats of the practice of *Yoga* the fourfold division of yogins, the means to *Yoga*, the succeeding of *Yoga*,<sup>10</sup> and the perfect state of *Yoga* with God<sup>11</sup>

11 The 7th Lecture discusses the exact knowledge of God, its concealment by *prakṛti*, the resorting to God the divisions of devotees and the superiority of the enlightened one

12 The 8th Lecture deals with the three divisions of aspirants, viz aspirants to 1 sovereignty, 2 knowledge of the *ātman*, 3 attainment of God,<sup>1</sup> and with the knowledge to be obtained and the qualities to be acquired by each

13 The 9th Lecture treats of the eminence of God and his divine superiority in human embodiment of the excellent character of the *mahātmans* and of the *bhaktiyoga*

14 To further the origination and increase of *bhakti*, the 10th Lecture sets forth in detail the knowledge of the infinite variety of God's beautiful qualities and the utter dependence of the universe on God

15 The 11th Lecture describes the immediate presentation of God and teaches that the quiddity of God can only by *bhakti* be known and attained<sup>12</sup>

16 The 12th Lecture treats of the rapid efficacy of *bhakti* and of the means of practising *bhakti*, directs the unqualified aspirant to the attainment of the *ātman* and discusses its modes, and explains how very dear the *bhakti* is to the devotee

17 The 13th Lecture discusses the proper form of the body, the reason why the *ātman* can be attained the purification of the *ātman*, the reason of the *ātman*'s bondage, and the discrimination between *ātman* and body

18 The 14th Lecture deals with the way in which the *gunas* bind the *ātman*, the agency of the *gunas* and their elimination, and explains how God is the basis of the three ends<sup>13</sup>

<sup>10</sup> I translate Gov.'s reading *yogasiddhiḥ*

<sup>11</sup> *sva-* refers to God, the Teacher of the Gita

<sup>12</sup> I translate Gov.'s reading

<sup>13</sup> I translate Gov.'s reading *tat-tvaṃ uktā* i. e. is the object governed by the nomina verbi *tritiyaḥ*

<sup>14</sup> the three ends and objectives summed up in 14.57 *brahman, dharma and sukha*.



19 The 15th Lecture argues that the Supreme Person is different from the spiritual creation, whether conjoined with the non spiritual or in its pure state, because He pervades, maintains and governs the universe

20 The 16th Lecture, after setting forth the division of the godly and the demoniac, contends submission to the sastra in order to corroborate the knowledge and the observance of the truth<sup>15</sup>

21 The 17th Lecture treats of the difference in qualities between all demoniac or non sâstic acts and sâstic acts and concludes by expounding the three characteristics of all acts which are sâstic

22 The last Lecture deals with the knowledge in virtue of which all agency is attributed to God, and of the necessity of cultivating sattva sets forth how personal acts develop (into the attainment of God) and concludes by stating the fundamental doctrine of the Bhagavadgita

23 Karmayoga is the observance of austerities, pilgrimages, charities sacrifices etc Jñanayoga is the fixation on the completely purified ātman with all inner emotions subdued

24 Bhaktiyoga is the fixation on meditation etc, born from love for exclusive concentration on the Supreme One All three yogas are inter connected

25 All three yogas serve to success in periodical and occasional sacrifices which are propitiations of God as well as in the presentation of the atman by means of Yoga

26 When all nescience has vanished and one has perceived the ātman which is attendant on God, then one may acquire perfect bhakti and thereby attain God's paradise

27 The bhaktiyoga serves to gain complete sovereignty<sup>16</sup> if that is desired All three yogas serve to attain the atman in its pure state,<sup>17</sup> if that is desired

28 The exclusive concentration on God is the same for all adhikâris<sup>18</sup> until they have achieved their ends When one aspires to the Supreme One, then one will fully attain Him

29 The jñānin, however, is exclusively concentrated on God the life of his atman depends on Him, his happiness and unhappiness are

<sup>15</sup> *tattvānuṣṭhānājnānasthemne*, *tattva* must refer to the topic of Lecture 15 (vs 19), so essentially R.

<sup>16</sup> the objective of the so-called aiśvaryārthin.

<sup>17</sup> the objective of the kaivalyārthin.

<sup>18</sup> i.e. aiśvaryārthins kaivalyārthins and jñānins.

brought about by his union with and separation from Him; his mind is focused on Him alone.

30. When he has attained the ātman by means of salutations, litanies and glorifications which are called the *yoga of meditation on God*,<sup>19</sup> then all operations of his 'prāṇas, mind, spirit and senses are directed towards God, and

31. urged upon by his love, he practises everything, from the performance of his personal duties to the cultivation of bhakti, as a means of attaining God; renouncing all personal interest he dedicates all to God in holy terror.<sup>20</sup>

32. Having found his sole happiness in exclusive concentration and perfect humility, he attains God's paradise.

This is the chief matter of the doctrine; and herewith ends the Summary of the Bhagavadgītā.

<sup>19</sup> or bhaktiyoga.

<sup>20</sup> *tāmabhiḥ*; this terror I take to signify the aspirant's fear of remaining in saṃsāra by cherishing his interest in the results of his acts.

# INDEX I

Quotations from the Bhagavadgītā in the Gitābhāṣya (cross-references)

2,1	GBn. 11,1	8,14	7,23; 8,22
2,11	2,16	8,20-21	8,13
2,12	2,10; 5,16; 11,1	9,1	18,64
2,12-30	2,39	9,3	9,31
2,17-18	2,16	9,4	18,46
2,22	18,31	9,7-8	13,2
2,29	15,15; 18,42	9,10	13,2; 15,4; 18,46
2,39	2,52	9,11	18,66
2,40	6,37	9,24	3,11
2,47	3,3	10,3	18,42
2,49	2,39	10,5	10,19
2,55	3,5	10,7	10,19; 18,46
3,8	18,7	10,8	10,13/18; 11,14; 15,4;
3,13	3,8; 18,7		16,7; 18,42/46/61
3,30	18,7/57	10,10-11	8,14
4,1	4,4	10,12-13	4,4
4,5	4,6	10, 19-31	11,14
4,7	4,6	10,20	13,2
4,9-11	18,66	10,21-38	13,2
4,19	6,2	11,11	11,0
4,36-37	5,15	11,12	11,10
5,19	4,35; 5,7; 6,29	11,13	11,0
5,27-29	6,37	11,36	11,19
5,29	18,42	11,38	11,40
6,10	15,16	11,53-54	7,0
6,19	6,29	11,54	18,56
6,33	6,29	12,2	12,20
6,40	2,40	12,3	8,21
6,46	11,1	12,7	12,1
7,4	7,19; 10,13	13,1	2,18
7,4-5	13,2	13,5-6	13,18
7,5	7,16; 7,19; 18,53; 14,3	13,7-11	13,18
7,6	15,4; 18,46	13,12-18	13,2
7,6-12	7,19	13,19	13,6
7,7	8,22; 18,42/46	13,20	13,22
7,13	8,22	13,24	14,3
7,14	14,27; 15,4	13,26	4,35; 12,4; 13,13; 15,16
7,17	18,65	14,2	3,15; 5,10; 13,2
7,17-18	7,19	14,3	3,30
7,19	7,3; 14,27	14,15	18,7
7,26	2,12; 7,3	14,17	14,26
8,3	8,21	14,19	13,12
8,11	8,3	14,25-27	

15,6	15,12	18,9	3,20
15,7	15,12	18,12	18,2
15,8	13,2	18,31	18,8
15,10	13,1	18,32	18,7
15,15	10,20; 18,15/42/61	18,43	2,31
15,16	8,21; 12,4; 13,2	18,46	3,3; 7,0; 12,11; 18,42
15,17	12,4	18,53	7,0
15,18	13,2	18,54	7,0; 12,11; 13,12
16,16	17,6	18,61	3,30; 10,20; 18,15
18,4	18,2/66	18,66	2,10
18,7	18,2		

## INDEX II

### Śruti and smṛti quotations in the Gitābhāṣya

AitĀr.		5,10,1	8,22/26
3,2,3 *)	10,33	5,15,6	8,22
ĀpÇ.		5,24,3	10,12
19,16,3	15,1	6,2,1	13,2
BĀU.		6,2,3	13,2
1,4,7	13,2	6,3,2	13,2
1,4,15	7,0	6,5,4	18,7
2,3,6	4,6	6,8,6-7	13,2
2,4,5	7,0	6,16,2	13,14
3,7,3	13,2	7,26,2	3,8; 13,14; 18,7
3,7,3-22	13,2; 15,15	8,1,1	15,15
3,7,22	3,30; 8,22; 9,4; 10,20; 13,12; 19,13; 18,61	8,1,5	13,2
3,8,9	9,6	8,3,4	3,0; 13,14; 18,7
4,4,5	2,18	8,7,1	3,0
4,4,16	10,12	8,12,2	3,0; 15,17
4,4,24	18,12	8,12,3	13,5; 15,17
4,5,6-7	13,2	GAS.	
4,5,11	13,2	5	2,10
4,5,15	13,2	6	2,72
ChUp.		Hariv.	
1,6,6	4,6	123,63 *)	10,13/14
3,13,7	10,12; 18,62	KāthakUp.	
3,14,2	4,6	2,23	11,54
4,14,3	10,12	KāthUp.	
4,15,6	8,22	2,12	3,0
5,2,15	8,22	2,18	3,0; 11,37; 13,2
5,9,1	8,3/22	2,20	3,0

\*) I have not been able to verify these quotations, which I borrow from Gov. in the text-editions available to me.

2,22-23	3,0
2,23	7,0
2,24	9,30
3,9	3,0
4,10-11	13,2
6,1	15,1

## MahânârUp.

1,3	11,24
1,8	4,6
10,5	3,3; 10,31
11,4	10,12
11,7	15,15

## MantrUp.

1	13,2
---	------

## Manu

1,5/8	9,7
3,76	3,14
12,122	3,30; 15,15

## MBh. \*)

2,38,23	4,4
3,88,23-24	10,13/14
12,171,63-64	9,26
13,149,92	17,25
13,159,137	13,4

## MaitrS.

1,10,1	15,1
--------	------

## MuṇḍUp.

1,1,4	11,18
1,1,5	12,4
1,1,9	2,12; 13,2
2,2,7	14,3
2,2,8	7,0
3,1,1	13,2
3,1,3	6,30; 12,4; 13,13
3,2,6	18,1
3,2,9	10,12

## NârUp.

4,12	18,1
6,11	13,10
10,21	18,62

## Nighaṇṭu

	4,6
--	-----

## B.V.

1,22,20	18,62
1,164,50	13,62

8,7,17	9,7
10,129,3	9,7
10,129,7	18,62

## SubâlUp.

2	7,6; 8,3; 13,2
7	9,7; 13,2

## ÇvetUp.

1,6/9	13,2
1,10	13,2
1,12	13,2
3,8	4,6; 7,0; 11,18
4,5/6	13,2
4,7	13,2
4,9	9,10; 13,12
4,10	7,14; 9,10; 13,12
6,7	3,31; 5,29
6,9	13,2/12
6,13	2,12/13,2
6,16	13,2/12
6,18	2,12; 10,3; 13,2
6,19	10,3; 13,13

## Taitt.Ār.

1,6,1	4,6
2,6,1-3	13,1/2
3,11,1	3,30; 13,2; 15,15; 18,13
3,12,7	7,0
3,13,1	4,6
3,13,2	4,10
3,16,1	18,65
8,7,1	13,12

## Taitt.Br.

3,5,10,4	2,41
3,7,7,14	2,31

## Taitt.S.

2,2,12,5	4,6
----------	-----

## TaittUp.

2,1	10,12; 13,2
3,1	10,12
8,1	9,6

## VP.

1,2,24	7,6
1,431-52	4,14
1,17,39	7,17
1,19,20	7,14
2,12,41-44	2,16
2,13,95	2,16

2,13 32-33	85	VS	
2,13 64-66	13,4	2 1 34/35	9,9
2,13 84	13,4	2 1,34	4,14
2,13,95	2,16	2 3,1-18	13,4
2,13,96 98	13 4	2 3 19 39	13,4
2,14,23 24	2,16	2 3 19/33	18,15
4,4,39 40	7,6	2 3,40	13,4, 18,15
5,3,10/12	11,50	2 3,41	18,15
6,7,72-73	2 61		

## INDEX III

- aṁśa- 152  
 akarman- 80  
 akṣara- 38, 70, 110 f, 128  
 agniśoma- 57  
 anga- 66, 161  
 adṛṣṭa- 157  
 adhyayasaya- 59, 134  
 anumati 27  
 aprthaksiddhi- 137  
 apohana 154  
 abhava- 122  
 abhimana- 19 65, 68, 133  
 abhyasa- 96 108 f  
 artha 30  
 avidhīpurvaka- 118  
 avyakta 56 111, 132 f 142  
 asat- 143  
 asattva- 55  
 ahaṁkāra- 68  
 atman passim  
 atmatattva- 55 86  
 atmanīṣṭha 67  
 atmayoga 131 134  
 atmavalokana 22  
 arambha 148  
 īśitavya- 50  
 upadesa 17 50  
 upādhi- 50  
 ekarasa- 35  
 ekavakyadhikarana- 29 f  
 aikarthyā- 29  
 aśvarya- 3, 23 f  
 aśvaryaṁthin 12 15 31 f, 103 ff  
 kamalāsanastha- 128  
 karman 31, 108  
 karmamīmāṁsa 29 f  
 kalyāṇagunas 37, 45 passim  
 kṛpīla- 163  
 kala 112 130  
 kūṭastha- 93, 133  
 kaivalya- 22 ff  
 kaivalyarthin- 15, 31 f, 103 ff  
 krodha- 63  
 klesas 172  
 kṣetrajñā- 50  
 jaramaranamokṣa- 106  
 jñāna- 154 passim  
 jnana- — vijñāna- 76 93, 100  
 jñānin- 12, passim  
 jyotiṣ 144  
 tṛṣṇā 148  
 tejas- 126, 156  
 daharavidyā 65, 112  
 dharmabhūtajñāna- 89  
 dhatṛ- 116  
 dhaman- 123, 131  
 dhura- 150  
 dhṛti- 94, 170  
 dhyana 99, 135 145, 172  
 Narayana 47  
 nirvana- 84  
 niscaya 59, 74  
 niṣṭha 66  
 naiṣkarmya- 67, 171  
 pañcagnividyā 31, 107  
 paramapurūṣartha- 47, 58  
 paravidyā 66 112  
 puruṣartha 47, 58  
 prakṛti- 19, passim  
 prajāpati- 69  
 prajñāpada- 49  
 pradarśanartham 37  
 prapatti- 24 f  
 prapti atman 65 137  
 prabhava- 121, 135  
 prabhu- 87  
 prasāda- 64, 161, 169  
 bādhitānuvṛtti- 51 f

buddhi- 59, 100, 102, 122, 134, 142  
 brahman- 34 f  
 brahmanirvāṇa- 65, 90  
 bhakti- 6, 22 f, 66, 99  
 bhaya- 63  
 bhavana- 122  
 bhāva- 122 f.  
 bhūta- 70 1., 122  
 bhedābheda- 50  
 bhoktr- ātman- 137  
 Mahat- 100, 147  
 mātṛas 54  
 māyā 36, 77, 102, 106  
 mukha- 83  
 muni- 36, 63  
 mṛtyu- 139  
 yāthātmyajñāna- 49  
 yāthārthajñāna- 49  
 yoga- 59 ff, 92, 109 passim  
 yogakṣema- 36, 61  
 योगेश्वरा- 127, 176  
 rasa- 64  
 rāga- 63, 148  
 līlā 46, 102  
 loka- 149, 154 f.

vāsanā 64, 107  
 vibhu- 87 f.  
 vibhūti- 3, 124  
 vīrya- 129  
 Vaukunṭha- 46  
 vairāgya- 96  
 vyavasāya- 120  
 śānti- 65, 84, 87, 120  
 śubhāśraya- 64  
 śraddhā 159  
 sat- 143  
 sattva- 55  
 satkāryavāda- 37, 57  
 satya- 156  
 saṃnyāsa- 85  
 śabdabrahman- 98  
 samādhi- 60, 63  
 sākṣātkāra- 21, 83, 126  
 sāmānādhikarāṇya- 101, 125 f  
 sāṃkhyā- 20 f, 37, 59, 66, 85, 145, 165  
 siddhi- 67, 171  
 sūri- 46  
 smṛti- 7, 99, 154  
 svabhāva- 159